

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

W. KURRELMAYER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
HAVENS, G. R.—Voltaire's Marginal Comments upon Pope's 'Essay on Man,' - - - - -	429
TORREY, N. L.—A Note on Voltaire's 'Commentaire historique,' - - -	439
ROVILLAIN, E.—L.-S. Mercier et l' 'Elegy' de Gray, - - - - -	442
RAYMOND, W. O.—Browning's First Mention of the Documentary Sources of the 'Ring and the Book,' - - - - -	445
RICE, W. G.—'The Grand Signiors Serraglio': Written by Master Robert Withers, - - - - -	450
ZEYDEL, E. H.—Nachträge zu Holteis 'Briefe an Tieck,' - - - - -	459
BRUNS, F.—Das Wort 'Physiologisch' bei Goethe, - - - - -	464
LANCASTER, H. C.—A Note on 'Hernani,' IV, 1, - - - - -	467
McKILLOP, A. D.—The First English Translation of 'Werther,' - - -	467
WILLIAMS, E. B.—Three Irregular Portuguese Imperfects, - - - - -	468
KRAPPE, A. H.—The Valkyrie Episode in the 'Njals Saga,' - - - - -	471

## REVIEWS:—

A. J. PERRY, <i>Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum</i> by John Trevisa; F. A. FOSTER, <i>A Stanzaic Life of Christ</i> ; B. WENDELL, <i>The History of the Translation of the Martyrs</i> . [G. H. Gerould.] - - -	475
E. WEEKLEY, <i>Surnames; Romance of Words</i> ; G. P. KRAPPE, <i>Knowledge of English</i> ; R. E. ZACHRISSON, <i>Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time</i> ; G. C. VAN LANGENHOVE, <i>Origin of the Gerund in English</i> . [W. F. Bryan.] - - - - -	478
E. K. CHAMBERS, <i>Arthur of Britain</i> ; R. E. ZACHRISSON, <i>Romans, Kelts and Saxons</i> . [K. Malone.] - - - - -	481
G. COHEN, <i>Le Théâtre en France au Moyen Age</i> . [L. Cons.] - - - - -	484
F. E. PIERCE and C. F. SCHREIBER, <i>Fiction and Fantasy of German Romance</i> ; K. BREUL, <i>The Romantic Movement in German Literature</i> . [A. W. Porterfield.] - - - - -	486
C. W. BEAUMONT, <i>The History of Harlequin</i> ; C. MIC, <i>La Commedia dell'arte</i> . [W. Smith.] - - - - -	489
Festskrift til HJALMAR FALK. [S. Einarsson.] - - - - -	490
M. S. STEELE, <i>Plays and Masques</i> ; E. WELSFORD, <i>The Court Masque</i> . [L. B. Wright.] - - - - -	492
C. P. CAMBIAIRE, <i>Poe in France</i> . [K. Campbell.] - - - - -	493
BRIEF MENTION - - - - -	495

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Seventy-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,  
and Raymond D. Havens

ADVISORY EDITORS

D. S. Blondheim, G. Chinard, E. Feise, J. C. French, E. Greenlaw,  
K. Malone, J. Robles, R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks, H. Spencer

---

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is  
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other  
countries included in the Postal Union.

---

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the  
Editors of Modern Language Notes, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.  
Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins  
Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

---

---

## *The Romanic Review*

Founded by

PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

### A QUARTERLY JOURNAL

Devoted to Research in the Romance  
Languages and Literatures

Edited by

JOHN L. GERIG,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,  
New York

Subscription price, \$4.00 per year

---

---

## NEW PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE OF FRENCH STUDIES

E. M. GRIMES,

The Lays of Desiré, Graelent and Meilon:  
Edition of the Texts with an Intro-  
duction .....\$1.25

Three interesting texts indispensable to  
the study of Old French literature. The  
Introduction forms a study of the *Lais* in  
French literature and indicates the historical  
position of the important poems here pub-  
lished, as well as their relation to the Ar-  
thurian legends.

R. CAULFEILD,

The French Literature of Louisiana....\$1.50

G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK,

The Legend of the Decadents.....\$1.50

B. MATULKA,

The Cid as a Courtly Hero: From the  
Amadis to Corneille.....\$ .75

---

Send orders to: G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK,

501 PHILOSOPHY HALL

Columbia University, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

---

---

8

,

to the  
ryland.  
pe.  
Hopkins

IE

.25

to  
The  
in  
ical  
ub-  
Ar-

.50

.50

.75





# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIII

NOVEMBER, 1928

Number 7

---

## VOLTAIRE'S MARGINAL COMMENTS UPON POPE'S *ESSAY ON MAN*

The great popularity of Pope's *Essay on Man*, in France and elsewhere on the Continent, as well as in England, is well known. Appearing first in English during the years 1733 and 1734, it was translated into French by Silhouette in 1736, by Du Resnel in 1737, and by de Seré in 1739. Several other French translations, besides reprints of those just mentioned, were published later during the eighteenth century.

Voltaire received Pope's poem (presumably only the first two epistles) as early as May, 1733,<sup>1</sup> if this undated letter to Du Resnel is correctly classified. For about seven or eight years thereafter (1733-1740) Voltaire, in his correspondence, commented rather frequently upon Pope and, in 1738 and 1739, paid him the homage of free imitation in his *Discours sur l'Homme*, yet even in this early period his admiration for Pope's deism was tempered by criticism of much that he considered false or obscure. By July 24, 1733, we find him writing to Thieriot in mingled English and French: "A propos d'épître, dites à M. Pope que je l'ai très-bien reconnu in his *Essay on Man*; 't is certainly his style. Now and then there is some obscurity; but the whole is charming."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Voltaire, *Œuvres* (Moland ed.), xxxiii, 339. In May, 1733, not for the first time in July, as M. Lanson implies (*Lettres philosophiques*, Paris, 1915-17, II, 146, n. 38), unless there should appear a reason for reclassifying this undated letter. The following letter of May 15 to Thieriot, with its mention of "le poème de Pope sur les Richesses" (Moland, xxxiii, 341), presumably refers to Pope's *Epistle, Of the Use of Riches, To Allen, Lord Bathurst*, not to the *Essay on Man*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, xxxiii, 364.

On February 12, 1736, Voltaire wrote: "C'est un beau poème, en anglais, quoique mêlé d'idées bien fausses sur le bonheur,"<sup>3</sup> and a month later, after a longer discussion of some details, he concluded: "Tout l'ouvrage de Pope fourmille de pareilles obscurités." It is true he added, mingling praise and blame as he had already done with Shakespeare: "Il y a cent éclaircs admirables qui percent à tous moments cette nuit."<sup>4</sup> In 1754 Voltaire still calls it "le premier des poèmes didactiques, des poèmes philosophiques,"<sup>5</sup> and echoes much of Pope's attitude in his *Poème sur la Loi naturelle* of 1752. Moreover, it should be remembered that the philosophic Optimism of Pope fused with that of Leibnitz had won the adherence of Voltaire's mistress, Mme du Châtelet, who exerted so much influence over him during the years together at Cirey.

But, as Voltaire grew older, the facile optimism which had satisfied him in his *Discours sur l'Homme* of 1738 and to which he had given partial expression also in *Zadig* of 1747 no longer was adequate to still his doubts. The death of Mme du Châtelet in 1749 removed from his side an ardent defender of Leibnitz. Voltaire's unhappy experiences in Germany, culminating in 1753 with the break between him and Frederick, his extensive reading of the wickedness and folly of mankind in preparation for his *Essai sur les mœurs*, perhaps also ill health, all inclined him still further toward a pessimistic interpretation of the realities of human existence. Then in 1755 the terrible earthquake at Lisbon provided the occasion, though not the cause, first for his *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne* of 1756, where his tone was serious and still respectful toward Pope but critical of current interpretations of evil and suffering, and finally three years later for *Candide*, where the mockery of Optimism is sardonic, and bitter, and peculiarly effective.<sup>6</sup>

Such, in briefest outline, is the history of Voltaire's attitude toward Pope. It offers the background necessary for the clearer understanding of his marginal comments upon his copy of the *Essay*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, xxxiv, 30.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, xxxviii, 219.

<sup>6</sup> This paragraph is mainly based upon part of M. André Morize's excellent Preface to his critical edition of *Candide*, Paris, 1913.

on *Man*, which is part of the private library of Voltaire, purchased, after his death, by Catherine the Great and now to be found in the Public Library at Leningrad.<sup>7</sup> Voltaire owned the two volume quarto edition of Pope published in English at London, the first volume by Lintot in 1717, the second by Gilliver in 1735.<sup>8</sup> All but one of his marginal notes are to be found in the second volume and these latter all deal with the *Essay on Man*. It is these marginal comments which will be presented in this article.

The first of these marginal notations in Voltaire's hand occurs near the beginning of Pope's poem at the eighth verse of the First Epistle.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 3-8)

Let Us (since Life can little more supply  
Than just to look about us, and to die)  
Expatiate free, o'er all this Scene of Man,  
A mighty Maze! but not without a Plan;  
A Wild, where weeds and flow'rs promiscuous shoot,  
Or Garden, tempting with *forbidden fruit*.

Voltaire

Mais, mon cher  
Pope, si c'est un  
fruit deffendu, tu  
n'y dois donc pas  
toucher.<sup>9</sup>

It is Voltaire who has underlined the words "*forbidden fruit*" to indicate the direction of his comment. Note the familiarity of the tone and the inclination to quibble over details.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 15-16)

Laugh where we *must*, be candid where we *can*,  
But vindicate the Ways of God to Man.

Voltaire

Il n'y a pas là de  
quoi rire; et voilà trop  
d'antithèses.

The evil in the world, Voltaire hints, is too great to leave much occasion for laughter. The attack upon antitheses refers to Pope's

<sup>7</sup> Professor Norman L. Torrey of Yale University and the author of this present article studied in this Voltaire library at Leningrad during the summer of 1927. A general article on Voltaire's books and marginalia will be published by them jointly in *PMLA* for December, 1928.

<sup>8</sup> Besides this two volume quarto edition of Pope in English, the Voltaire library contains only: Du Resnel's translation, *Essai sur la critique*, Paris, 1730, in-12; and Genet's *Lettres choisies de Pope sur différens sujets de morale et de littérature*, 2 tomes in 1 vol., 1753, in-12. Neither of these works contains place markers or marginalia. There is no trace of the first edition of the *Essay on Man* of 1733 which Voltaire perhaps never received back from Du Resnel. Cf. Moland, xxxiii, 339.

<sup>9</sup> Voltaire's spelling has been preserved, but not his complete lack of punctuation and capitalization.

perhaps over-numerous contrasts beginning with Line 6: *a Maze . . . not without a Plan; a Wild . . . a Garden; weeds . . . flow'rs; the open . . . the covert; latent tracts . . . giddy heights; creep . . . soar.*

Pope (Epistle I, lines 23-32)

Voltaire

He who thro' vast Immensity can pierce,  
See worlds on worlds compose one Universe,  
Observe how System into System runs,  
What other Planets, and what other Suns?  
What vary'd Being peoples ev'ry Star?  
May tell, why Heav'n has made us as we are.  
But of this frame the bearings, and the Ties,  
The strong connections, nice dependencies,  
Gradations just, has thy pervading soul  
Look'd thro'? or can a Part contain the Whole?

No, but a part can  
canvass the laws of the  
whole.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 35-38)

Voltaire

Presumptuous Man! the Reason would'st thou find  
Why form'd so weak, so little, and so blind?  
First, if thou can'st, the harder reason guess  
Why form'd no weaker, blinder, and no less?

J'ay dit cela il y a  
quarante ans.

In 1756 Voltaire introduced into the text of the *Lettres philosophiques*, which had not previously mentioned the *Essay on Man*, a long passage of which the following is a part:

J'ai été flatté, je l'avoue, de voir qu'il [Pope] s'est rencontré avec moi dans une chose que j'avais dite il y a plusieurs années. "Vous vous étonnez que Dieu ait fait l'homme si borné, si ignorant, si peu heureux. Que ne vous étonnez-vous qu'il ne l'ait pas fait plus borné, plus ignorant, & plus malheureux?" Quand un Français & un Anglais pensent de même, il faut bien qu'ils aient raison.<sup>20</sup>

Voltaire is referring to a passage similar to Pope in his own *Remarques sur Pascal*:

L'état présent de l'Homme n'est-il pas un bienfait du Créateur? Qui vous a dit que Dieu vous en devoit davantage? Qui vous a dit que votre être exigeoit plus de connoissances & plus de bonheur? Qui vous a dit qu'il en comporte davantage? Vous vous étonnez que Dieu ait fait l'Homme

<sup>20</sup> Voltaire, *Lettres philosophiques* (ed. by G. Lanson, 2nd ed., Paris, 1915-17), II, 139-40. (Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 145-46, notes 30, 34. Cf. also the Moland ed. of Voltaire, xxii, 178).

si borné, si ignorant, si peu heureux; que ne vous étonnez-vous qu'il ne l'ait pas fait plus borné, plus ignorant, plus malheureux? Vous vous plaignez d'une vie si courte & si infortunée; remerciez Dieu de ce qu'elle n'est pas plus courte & plus malheureuse.<sup>11</sup>

It is evident that both in the marginal comment given above and in the 1756 version of the *Lettres philosophiques* Voltaire had reference to the passage just cited from his *Remarques sur Pascal*. The statement: "Quand un Français et un Anglais pensent de même, il faut bien qu'ils ayent raison," loses, however, its force, when we learn that this particular Remark on Pascal did not appear with the others in the 1734 edition of the *Lettres philosophiques*, in which, as we have seen, no mention had been made of the *Essay on Man*,<sup>12</sup> but was added in 1739<sup>13</sup> after Pope's poem had been in Voltaire's hands for nearly six years. Instead of this being a case where Voltaire, as he suggests, has independently and antecedently expressed the same thought as his English contemporary, it appears on the contrary very clear that it is Pope who has here influenced Voltaire, and that the latter is trying to cover up his tracks. Voltaire's marginal note is of further interest as suggesting that all these marginal comments on Pope were made rather late in Voltaire's lifetime. If we take the "quarante ans," not as an accurate measure, but as expressing in round numbers a long time, then these marginal notes may probably be dated as of the Ferney period. Other evidence, as we shall see, points in the same direction.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 39-42)

Voltaire

Ask of thy mother Earth, why oaks are made

Taller or stronger than the weeds they shade?

Or ask of yonder argent fields above,

Why Jove's Satellites are less than Jove?

Ridiculous, for a satellite ought to be lesser.

Voltaire's criticism does not touch the real point at issue, which is why the relationship of satellite to planet should exist at all.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 209. (Cf. Moland, XXII, 44, and n.)

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 146, n. 38. Voltaire, as we have seen, read the first part of the *Essay on Man* probably as early as May, 1733, but this was probably too late for him conveniently to mention the work in the *Lettres philosophiques*, which were already in press.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 209. This is the edition published by Ledet, Amsterdam, 1738-39, 4 vols., in-8. Cf. *ibid.*, I, xv.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 43-48)

Voltaire

Of Systems possible, if 'tis confest  
That Wisdom infinite must form the best,  
Where all must full, or not coherent be,  
And all that rises, rise in due degree;  
Then, in the scale of life and sense, 'tis plain  
There must be, some where, such a rank as Man;

Yes, since he exists.

Voltaire's matter-of-fact comment reduces the whole argument to the basis of things as we know them. We know only what is and cannot know whether things are as they ought to be or not.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 49-50)

Voltaire

And all the question (wrangle 'ere so long)  
Is only this, if God has plac'd him wrong?

No, but why he made  
him so miserable.

Voltaire's emphatic "no" occurs twice in comment upon this passage. It is found alone on the right hand margin and then a second time, with the further comment given above, on the left. Thus it is the problem of Evil with which Voltaire, here as often elsewhere, is concerned, and he intimates that Pope dodges the question.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 57-58)

Voltaire

So Man, who here seems principal alone,  
*Perhaps* acts second to a Sphere unknown.

No *perhaps* when we  
reason.

Whether by "a Sphere unknown" Pope here means another world with its possible inhabitants, to whom man is subordinate, whether he means that man's destiny may be governed by the stars, or whether he means God, is not clear. In Voltaire's reply we seem to see him as a convinced deist taking Pope in the latter sense. There is no doubt in his mind that reasoning must lead to the conclusion that God exists and that man is in a secondary position to Him.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 69-70)

Voltaire

Then say not Man's imperfect, Heav'n in fault?  
Say rather, Man's as perfect as he ought;

C'est là le point de la  
question et il n'est pas  
traitté.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 77-80<sup>14</sup>)

Voltaire

Heav'n from all creatures hides the book of Fate,  
All but the page prescrib'd, their present state,

Tu parles d'esprits;<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Lines 77-80 in the Elwin-Courthope edition of Pope; lines 73-76 in the 1735 Gilliver edition which Voltaire used.

<sup>15</sup> Similarly, when Locke wrote: "L'esprit peut mettre des corps en



From Brutes what Men, from Men what *Spirits* know, il faut auparavant prou-  
Or who could suffer Being here below? ver qu'il y en a.

Pope (Epistle I, line 91<sup>16</sup>)

Voltaire

*Hope* humbly then; with trembling pinions soar; What can I hope when  
all is right?

Pope (Epistle I, lines 99-112<sup>17</sup>)

Voltaire

Lo! the poor Indian, whose untutor'd mind  
Sees God in clouds, or hears him in the wind;

Yet simple Nature to his Hope has giv'n,  
Behind the cloud-topt hill, an humbler heav'n,

To be, contents his natural desire,  
He asks no Angel's wing, nor Seraph's fire,  
But thinks, admitted to that *equal* Sky,  
His faithful Dog shall bear him company.

Voilà une plaisante es-  
pérance de vivre éternel-  
lement avec son chien.

Voltaire's irony is characteristic. He uses similar methods, much more violently and unfairly, in commenting upon his enemies, such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau.<sup>18</sup>

Pope (Epistle I, lines 113-118<sup>19</sup>)

Voltaire

Go, wiser thou! and in thy scale of sense  
Weigh thy Opinion against Providence:  
Call Imperfection what thou fancy'st such;  
Say, here he gives too little, there too much:  
Destroy all Creatures for thy sport or gust,  
Yet cry, if Man's unhappy, God's unjust,

Peut-on donc ne pas  
gémir d'être en proie à  
tant de maux? Pouras-  
tu [sic] nous prouver que  
tout cela est si bon?

This frequent preoccupation with the question of Evil strengthens one's conviction that these comments of Voltaire date from the period of the Lisbon earthquake (1755) or later.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 123-128<sup>20</sup>)

Voltaire

In reas'ning Pride (my Friend) our error lies;  
All quit their sphere, and rush into the Skies.

mouvement" (Locke, *Essai . . . concernant l'Entendement humain*, Amsterdam, 1758, II, 317), Voltaire commented: *Idee des esprits à examiner. . . Obscur et douteux.*"

<sup>16</sup> Elwin-Courthope, line 91; Gilliver, 1735, line 87.

<sup>17</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 99-112; Gilliver, 1735, lines 95-108.

<sup>18</sup> As I hope to show in a forthcoming study dealing with Voltaire's *Marginal Comments on Rousseau*.

<sup>19</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 113-118; Gilliver, 1735, lines 109-114.

<sup>20</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 123-128; Gilliver, 1735, lines 119-124.



Pride still is aiming at the blest abodes,  
Men would be Angels, Angels would be Gods.  
Aspiring to be Gods, if Angels fell,  
Aspiring to be Angels, Men rebell:

Pitoiable sottise!

Voltaire scornfully rejects these references to angels and the stories of their revolt and fall, and does not tolerate Pope's use of them as a poetic device.

Pope (Epistle I, line 161 <sup>21</sup>)

Voltaire

From Pride, from Pride, our very reas'ning springs;

No, but from our wants  
and from our own miseri.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 173-74 <sup>22</sup>)

What would this Man? now upward will he soar,  
And little less than *Angel*, would be more;

Voltaire underlined the word *angel* without comment, but doubtless from the same motive as in the passage he had just called a "pitoyable sottise." He objects to this introduction of mythical beings into a deistic and semi-rationalistic poem.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 195-206 <sup>23</sup>)

Voltaire

Say what the use, were finer opticks giv'n,  
T'inspect a Mite, not comprehend the Heav'n?  
Or Touch, if tremblingly alive all o'er,  
To smart, and agonize at ev'ry pore?  
Or keen Effluvia darting thro' the brain,  
Die of a Rose, in aromatic pain?  
If Nature thunder'd in his opening ears,  
And stunn'd him with the music of the Spheres,  
How would he wish that Heav'n had left him still  
The whispering Zephyr, and the purling rill?  
Who finds not Providence all-good and wise,  
Alike in what it gives, and what denies?

Tout cela n'a rien  
de comun [sic] avec la  
souffrance et avec le  
crime.

Once more Voltaire returns to what is for him the central question, the problem of Evil. Until that is satisfactorily explained, Voltaire is not ready to believe that "all is for the best in the best possible of worlds."

<sup>21</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 161; Gilliver, 1735, line 153.

<sup>22</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 173-74; Gilliver, 1735, lines 165-166.

<sup>23</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 195-206; Gilliver, 1735, lines 187-198.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 245-46 <sup>24</sup>)

From Nature's Chain whatever link you strike,  
Tenth or ten thousandth, breaks the Chain alike.

Voltaire

Cela n'est pas vrai.  
La destruction du Mu-  
rèse n'a pas anéanti le  
monde. Otez de ce  
globe les animaux; il  
n'en roulera pas moins  
dans l'espace.

Voltaire attacks the idea, characteristic of the Pope-Leibnitzian philosophy, that each stage of life or matter constituted an integral and necessary part of the whole.<sup>25</sup> Each was thought to be a link in the chain of things and each must exist as it did or the whole would break.

These comments have all been upon the First Epistle of Pope's four Epistles on Man. Two more comments follow upon the Second Epistle and after that there are no others, though one passage is marked with a paper bookmark.<sup>26</sup>

Pope (Epistle II, lines 101-102 <sup>27</sup>)

In lazy *Apathy* let Stoics boast  
Their Virtue fix'd; 'tis fix'd as in a Frost,

Voltaire

Tout est faux dans  
cet ouvrage: le stoï-  
cien Caton, le stoïcien  
Marc-Aurèle languis-  
saient-ils dans une  
honteuse apathie?

So Voltaire pours cold water upon Pope's rhetoric. He is evidently reading it with those keen, shrewd eyes whose glint still lingers for us in Houdon's famous statue. He will not easily let himself be the dupe of fine phrases, but penetrates through them to scrutinize intently the thought beneath, and often in this first part of the poem he has found it wanting. If he has not continued to annotate, it is probably not because he agreed more with the other epistles, but simply because he wearied of the task. In all

<sup>24</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 245-246; Gilliver, 1735, lines 237-238.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. an excellent article by Arthur O. Lovejoy, "*Optimism and Romanticism*," *PMLA*, XLII (Dec., 1927), with its observations on "the principle of plenitude," pp. 930-32.

<sup>26</sup> Between pp. 62-63 of the 1735 edition; Epistle IV, Elwin-Courthope, lines 95-134; Gilliver, 1735, lines 93-130. The passage was perhaps marked because of its emphasis on the sovereignty of general physical laws.

<sup>27</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 101-102; Gilliver, 1735, lines 91-92.

probability, he would not have departed from his dictum: "Tout est faux dans cet ouvrage." He had already written in 1736, referring obviously to the Fourth Epistle of the *Essay on Man*, on Happiness, that Pope's poem was "mêlé d'idées bien fausses sur le bonheur."<sup>27</sup>

Pope (Epistle II, lines 131-132 <sup>28</sup>)

And hence one Master Passion in the breast,  
Like Aaron's Serpent, swallows up the rest.<sup>29</sup>

Voltaire

Comparaison mal  
placée et prise des ser-  
mons de Smalldridge.<sup>30</sup>

The chief interest of this comment lies in the indication that Voltaire presumably had some acquaintance with George Smalldridge's *Sixty Sermons, preached on Several Occasions*, which, as it happens, were published in 1726, the very year of Voltaire's arrival in England. Bishop Smalldridge was well esteemed by Steele, Swift, and other famous men of the day, including later Dr. Johnson, who praised his sermons highly. Hence, it would not have been at all strange if Voltaire, interested as he was in theological subjects, had read these sermons during, or after, his stay in England.

This completes Voltaire's marginal comments on Pope's *Essay*. There are nineteen of them in all, twelve in French and seven in English. Four of the English comments come in direct succession, the other three are interspersed one at a time in the midst of those in French. The English comments are perfectly idiomatic and show that Voltaire was able to write down his thoughts readily and correctly in this foreign language. He seems to have used here whichever language came first to mind, and, though it is not strange that his own French should be employed nearly twice as frequently, it is none the less significant that he should have used English in more than one third of the notes. There is no evidence that these marginalia were written at different times. The whole of the text covered, slightly over four hundred lines, could easily have been read, pen in hand, at a sitting. The general tenor of the comments is the same throughout, and from the reference to "il y a quarante ans" and from the preoccupation with the problem of

<sup>27</sup> Voltaire, *Œuvres*, xxxiv, 30. Cf. *supra*, text and n. 3.

<sup>28</sup> Elwin-Courthope, 131-132; Gilliver, 1735, lines 121-122.

<sup>29</sup> *Exodus*, vii, 12; "For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents; but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods."

<sup>30</sup> George Smalldridge (1663-1719), Bishop of Bristol.

Evil, as well as from the hostile tone, they appear to date from the Ferney period. These comments do not indicate that, at the time they were jotted down, Voltaire was making a reasoned study of Pope's poem. It appears rather that one day Voltaire, rereading the *Essay on Man*, vented his spleen for a little while against the author he had formerly admired, but never unreservedly. These marginal notes, while often intrinsically unimportant, illuminate the workings of Voltaire's mind and show him coolly analytical, rationalistic, often trivial, entering into direct and familiar colloquy with his author, judging this philosophical poem strictly from the point of view of its content as a treatise on man's place and destiny and finding it in many respects wanting.<sup>81</sup>

GEORGE R. HAVENS.

Ohio State University.

#### A NOTE ON VOLTAIRE'S *COMMENTAIRE HISTORIQUE*.

Among the volumes in Voltaire's library at Leningrad there is a copy of the *Commentaire historique sur les œuvres de l'auteur de la Henriade* (Neufchâtel, 1776), filled with corrections and additions in Wagnière's hand-writing. This copy was procured from Wagnière and sent to Catherine II in June, 1781, three years after Voltaire's death.<sup>1</sup> Wagnière called it "mon exemplaire du *Commentaire historique*," or often, probably to carry out Voltaire's wishes, "mon *Commentaire historique*," for the original work passed for some time as Wagnière's own. The proposed new edition with these corrections and additions<sup>2</sup> was never published, and the *Commentaire historique* began to be considered Voltaire's own work. Wagnière abandoned his corrections along with the deception, but his additions have been printed in much the same form in the joint *Mémoires* of Longchamp and Wagnière.<sup>3</sup> The Leningrad

<sup>81</sup> Several valuable comments and suggestions have been made by Professor F. B. Kaye of Northwestern University, and these are here gratefully acknowledged.

<sup>1</sup> "Une Correspondance inédite de Grimm avec Wagnière," *R. H. L.* (1898), III, 517.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Mémoires sur Voltaire et sur ses ouvrages* (Paris, 1826), 2v. in-8.

copy reveals certain interesting sidelights on Voltaire's life and character and on the once disputed authorship of the *Commentaire historique*.

Beuchot, in his *Avertissement* to the *Commentaire historique* reprinted in the Moland edition of Voltaire's works,<sup>4</sup> has given as his reasons for believing that Voltaire was the real author, two passages in which Voltaire, evidently in the heat of dictation, forgot to employ the third person: "J'étais, en 1732," wrote the author, "à la première représentation de *Zaïre*." Beuchot remarks justly that neither of the supposed authors, Wagnière and Christin, was yet born at this date, and points out the same anachronism in the passage: "J'ai entendu, il y a quarante ans, cette belle chanson." Beuchot could have settled Voltaire's authorship of the treatise conclusively if he had noticed that Wagnière, in the *Avis préliminaire* to his *Additions au Commentaire historique*, categorically refers to Voltaire as "le véritable auteur."<sup>5</sup> It is none the less true that Wagnière spoke of the work for many years as his own<sup>6</sup> and tried to make the public so believe. To this end, certain corrections in the first edition were plainly necessary. First, he corrected Voltaire's slips into the first person, quoted above from Beuchot, removing that very apparent difficulty. And secondly, he erased all favorable references to the talents of Mme Denis, for these would contrast strangely with the apparent animus which he bore that lady in the additional notes he was then writing.

Wagnière's notes in the Leningrad copy, written in 1781 and antedating the *Additions* published in 1826, have a certain historical interest.<sup>7</sup> Slightly less complete than the published *Additions*, they contain other material, of which some appears elsewhere, as in his *Examen des Mémoires de Bachaumont*, while some gives interesting details which Wagnière or his editor saw fit to delete or to modify.

<sup>4</sup> I, 69-70.

<sup>5</sup> *Mémoires*, I, 7.

<sup>6</sup> *Mémoires*, I, 6; and Beuchot's *Avertissement* (*supra*).

<sup>7</sup> They were written partly on the margin or at the bottom of the page, but often, on account of their great length, on extra pages pasted in; hence Grimm's expression in a letter to Catherine: "les commentaires sur la vie de M. de Voltaire, enrichis de cahiers manuscrits du fidèle Wagnière." *Op. cit.*, p. 517.

The important variants only will be listed below:

1.) The *Avis préliminaire* differs from that given by Beuchot as well as from that of the published *Additions*, and represents an intermediate stage. The new material appears in the second paragraph:

Je le communiquai (le petit précis historique) à mon maître qui eut la complaisance d'y jeter [sic] un coup d'oeil, et de me fournir encor quelques instructions qui furent écrites de la main de M. Durey de Morsan, beaufrère de M. de Sauvigny, Intendant de Paris.

Durey's name was one of the three that appeared in the first edition, with those of Wagnière and Christin. Wagnière abandoned this mention of Durey's collaboration in his later version.

2.) On the date of Voltaire's birth, Wagnière notes: "J'ai vu à Paris son extrait batistaire, qui porte, que M. de Voltaire est né le 20e novembre, et a été batisé le lendemain, 21e novembre, 1649." Thus, when Wagnière wrote in his *Additions*: "La vérité est qu'il naquit le 20 février 1694, et non le 20 novembre," it was on information received second-hand, and after Voltaire's death. (*Mémoires*, I, 19).

3.) At the time of his presentation to Ninon de Lenclos, Voltaire "avait à peu près treize ans;" corrected in the *Additions* (*Mémoires*, I, 20) to: "Il ne pouvait en effet avoir plus d'onze à douze ans." (See Desnoiresterres: *La Jeunesse de Voltaire*, p. 34).

4.) Wagnière gives in full the doubtful anecdote of Arouet père at a representation of *Oedipe*. This was suppressed in the *Additions*, but given with reserves in a note by the editor. (*Mémoires*, I, 22).

5.) Wagnière refers to an event in Voltaire's life "qui a fait dire à ses ennemis qu'il ne reconnaissait d'autre Dieu que l'argent." This has been softened in the *Additions* to: "que ses ennemis traitaient d'avarice." Wagnière, considered the principal victim of Voltaire's niggardliness, strove almost alone to defend his master's memory against that charge. (*Mémoires*, I, 24).

6.) No mention is made, in this earlier version, of Voltaire's travels to different German courts with de Chasot, nor of the "lavements au savon." Desnoiresterres has disproved these later additions. (*Mémoires*, I, 35, 36. Desnoiresterres, *Voltaire et Frédéric*, pp. 64-65).

7.) Wagnière gives Voltaire's facetious and daring poem to the



pope, Ganganeli. This poem, suppressed in the *Additions*, is found in Voltaire's correspondence, in a letter addressed to Cardinal Bernis. (*Oeuvres*, XLVII, 553).

8.) Wagnière refutes the charge that Voltaire was greatly chagrined at the Emperor's failure to pay him a visit while passing. This refutation is found substantially the same in the *Examen des Mémoires de Bachaumont* (*Mémoires*, I, 417), except for one striking detail. "Pendant ce temps," writes Wagnière, "l'Empereur passa; alors M. de Voltaire vint et fit avec ses mains ce qu'on appelle un pied de nez, en riant beaucoup, et se moquant de toute cette assemblée, répétant, *ne vous l'avais-je pas bien dit?*" The "pied de nez," later suppressed, did not strengthen Wagnière's case. But since it was, as M. Lanson says, "une déclaration de principes, et un affront personnel, quand le comte de Falkenstein, le futur Joseph II, ne daigne pas se détourner de sa route vers Ferney," one may be pardoned for preferring Voltaire's heroic gesture to Wagnière's well-meaning reserves. (Lanson: *Voltaire*, p. 138).

9.) Wagnière wrote of Voltaire: "Le fond de son caractère était extrêmement gai. Il était d'une politesse enchanteresse, surtout envers le sexe." The second sentence is suppressed in the *Additions*, lest weight be added to certain malicious charges advanced by Voltaire's enemies. (Cf. *Mémoires*, I, 94).

NORMAN L. TORREY.

Yale University.

---

#### L-S. MERCIER ET L'ELEGY DE GRAY

Après avoir circulé quelque temps en forme manuscrite, sous l'égide de H. Walpole, l'*Elégie composée dans un cimetière de campagne* fut publiée à Londres en 1751, et Gray entra dans l'immortalité. Pour comprendre l'impression profonde que ce poème produisit en Angleterre, il n'est besoin que de rappeler les paroles prononcées huit ans plus tard par le général Wolfe, le conquérant du Canada, la nuit précédant la bataille où il devait trouver la mort avec son adversaire, Montcalm.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. B. Willson, *The Life and Letters of James Wolfe*, p. 487, note 1. London, W. Heineman, 1909. In-8.



Si l'engouement du public français pour les choses anglaises avait été aussi vif vers 1750 que nous le voulons bien croire aujourd'hui, l'*Élégie* de Gray n'eût pas attendu quatorze ans pour franchir le détroit. A la vérité, et en dépit des Saint-Evremond, des Van Effen, des Thémiseul de Saint-Hyacinthe, des Prévost, des Desfontaines, des Montesquieu, des Voltaire, des Arnaud, des Suard, des Fréron, et des Gerbier, les idées anglaises pénétraient bien lentement en France, alors qu'elles avaient déjà acquis droit de cité en Hollande, en Suisse et en Allemagne.

L'*Élégie* composée dans un cimetière de campagne fut enfin traduite en prose par Mme Curchod de Nasse Necker, et publiée en 1765 par la *Gazette Littéraire*, ci-devant *Journal Etranger*.

Comme si l'intervalle de quatorze années entre la publication et la première traduction française de l'*Élégie* n'était pas encore suffisant, certains manuels de littérature adoptent la date de 1768 donnée par Quérard; date erronée puisque c'est celle de la réimpression de la traduction de Mme de Necker dans les *Variétés Littéraires* de Suard et d'Arnaud.

Les traductions se succédèrent si rapidement après cette date, qu'on en comptait trente-huit et plus vingt-huit réimpressions, en 1912,<sup>2</sup> parmi lesquelles celles de Le Tourneur, de Chateaubriand,<sup>3</sup> et de Marie-Joseph Chénier. Ce n'est qu'au commencement du dix-neuvième siècle, cependant, que l'influence de Gray se fait sentir dans le romantisme français, avec Chateaubriand et Lamartine, car précédemment les *Nuits* de Young occupaient tous les esprits.

L. S. Mercier, et c'est ce qui fait son intérêt, n'a pas attendu si longtemps pour s'inspirer de l'*Élégie* de Gray, et il semble bien qu'il l'ait le premier introduite dans le roman. Quels que soient les fautes de style et de composition, le manque de goût et les paradoxes de cet auteur "sourdement célèbre au commencement de la Révolution,"<sup>4</sup> ses oeuvres méritent plus et mieux qu'une mention dédaigneuse. Une des figures les plus vivantes du pré-romantisme français, Mercier,—et nous n'oublions pas Diderot—nous a donné, avant Sedaine, une esquisse assez réussie du drame

<sup>2</sup> Cf. C. Northup, *A Bibliography of Thomas Gray*. Yale Univ. Press, 1917. In-8.

<sup>3</sup> *Les Tombeaux champêtres*. *Journal de Peltier*, Londres, 11 décembre 1797.

<sup>4</sup> C. Monselet, *Les Oubliés et les Dédaignés*, p. 67. Paris, 1861. In-12.

bourgeois, tandis qu'il partage avec Collé et Du Belloy la gloire, plutôt douteuse, d'avoir préparé la voie au drame historique. Il est aussi, et surtout, l'auteur du *Tableau de Paris* qu'historiens et romanciers ont pillé et pillent encore à l'envi, sans même prendre la peine de le citer.

En 1767, L. S. Mercier publia *L'Homme sauvage*,<sup>5</sup> alors que le primitivisme et le naturalisme de J.-J. Rousseau enflammaient tous les esprits, et que la valeur comparative du sauvage et du civilisé était devenue un des thèmes obligatoires de notre littérature.

Cette oeuvre de jeunesse eut un succès relatif, mais elle compte, néanmoins, quatre éditions au dix-huitième siècle: deux françaises, une hollandaise et une allemande. C'est en partie l'histoire du chef d'une tribu indienne décimée et réduite à l'esclavage par l'avarice et le fanatisme des Espagnols. Echappant à toute poursuite, il se réfugie dans un désert avec ses deux enfants, un garçon et une fille, qu'il élève au sein de la bonne nature. Tel le serpent de la Bible, un Européen s'introduit dans cet Eden, et pour remercier le vieux chef de son accueil fraternel, il l'empoisonne. Ce dernier meurt au milieu d'horribles souffrances, pleuré de ses enfants qui se lamentent en ayant soin de suivre de très près le texte de l'*Elégie* de Gray ainsi qu'en fait foi l'extrait suivant:

Hélas! dis-je tristement à Zaka, voilà donc l'étroite et éternelle demeure de ce père chéri? Le chant des oiseaux, la beauté de la Nature, la renaissance du jour, notre voix plaintive qui percera l'ombre de ces arbres touffus, rien ne pourra le faire sortir de ce lit effrayant: il habitera toujours avec la mort cette sombre solitude. Nous ne le verrons plus devancer le retour du soleil, respirer les parfums du matin, et d'un pas majestueux faire jaillir la rosée du sommet des fleurs. Nous ne le verrons plus errer au hasard dans la forêt, plongé dans une douce méditation, levant ses mains pures vers la voûte du firmament; rien ne peut plus réchauffer sa froide poussière! il ne nous pressera plus dans ses bras paternels, le sourire sur les lèvres et l'amour dans les yeux. O terre! conserve-le dans ton sein; si la Nature jette un cri du fond des tombeaux, qu'il voit nos larmes, qu'il entende nos gémissements, et les louanges que nous donnons à son coeur bienfaisant et sincère. Il étoit né pour la gloire et les éloges de la renommée; mais il appartient à la raison, à la sagesse, à la douce mélancolie; il aime ses enfants, ses enfants le pleureront éternellement; et; pour tout dire, il fut roi, et il eut un ami! \*

<sup>5</sup> *L'Homme sauvage*, Histoire traduite de . . . par M. Mercier. Amsterdam, Zacherie, MDCCCLXVI. In-12.

\* *L'Homme sauvage* (1767), pp. 202 sq.

Durant plus de vingt ans, Mercier vécut dans la même maison et en étroite amitié avec le célèbre traducteur Le Tourneur; ils travaillaient souvent ensemble et échangeaient des idées. En 1767, Le Tourneur se préparait à traduire l'*Elégie* de Gray qu'il devait publier peu d'années après, et il est probable que *L'Homme sauvage* de Mercier s'est ressenti de ce contact. Quoiqu'il en soit, et pour la première fois, croyons-nous, l'*Elégie composée dans un cimetière de campagne* cesse d'être une pure traduction; elle entre, avec Mercier, dans notre littérature, fait corps avec l'action du roman et aide quelque peu au développement des caractères. Mercier en tire des effets littéraires assez pauvres, sans doute, et que les grands romantiques n'auront aucune peine à surpasser, mais il leur a, tout au moins, indiqué le chemin qu'ils ne tarderont pas à suivre.

EUGÈNE ROVILLAIN.

University of Michigan.

---

#### BROWNING'S FIRST MENTION OF THE DOCUMENTARY SOURCES OF *THE RING AND THE BOOK*

In an article on the genesis of *The Ring and the Book* recently printed in *MLN*.<sup>1</sup>, I have shown that Browning's letter written from Biarritz to Miss Blagden, containing his allusion to "the Roman murder story," should be dated Sept. 19, 1864, not Sept. 19, 1862. Were no new information at hand, this would place the first known reference in the poet's correspondence to the origins of *The Ring and the Book* two years later than has hitherto been supposed. But, at this point, the letter of Sept. 19, 1862 written by Browning to Isa Blagden from Ste. Marie, près Pornic, noted in my previous article, makes an *amende honorable*. It proves, convincingly, that the Biarritz letter to Miss Blagden, with its allusion to the theme of *The Ring and the Book*, cannot have been written on Sept. 19, 1862. Then, having shifted the accepted date of the first known mention, in writing, of the Roman murder

<sup>1</sup> June, 1928. Through the kindness of Mr. Thomas J. Wise and Mr. T. H. Hood, I have received additional evidence in confirmation of my article. Mr. Hood, who is editing the Browning letters in the Wise collection, has transcribed a number of extracts from the poet's correspond-

story, it obligingly provides us with a new and, up to the present, unnoticed reference to the documents used in the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. "The wheel is come full circle" and, curiously enough in view of what has transpired, the first literary allusion of Browning to the sources of the poem is contained, as has always been supposed, in a letter addressed to Isa Blagden on Sept. 19, 1862.<sup>1a</sup> Only, this initial mention of the narrative on which the poem was based, occurs in the 1862 letter written at Ste. Marie, Brittany, not in the 1864 letter written at Biarritz in the Basses-Pyrénées. Browning's reference to the source of *The Ring and the Book*, in his Ste. Marie letter to Miss Blagden of Sept. 19, '62, is, as follows:

If you see Mrs. Baker, tell her that I was quite unable to call on her during the day or two she was at Bayswater, & that I am sorry for it. Another thing, she promised to lend me a MS. account of the trial of Count Francesco Guidi for the murder of his wife, which I am anxious to collate with my own collection of papers on the subject: she told me she had lent it to Trollope, along with other documents which she thought might interest him, and that he found nothing in this subject to his purpose. Can you ask him if there was no mistake in her statement, if the account really related to my Count Francesco Guidi of Arezzo? Because, in that case, with her leave (which I shall beg your kindness to ask) I should greatly like to see it, would find some friend to bring me the papers and would return them safely and expeditiously.<sup>2</sup>

ence with Isa Blagden bearing out the facts that Browning was at Pornic in the autumn of 1862 and at Biarritz in the autumn of 1864. In particular, my conclusion that, after leaving Cambo on Sept. 13, 1864, Browning spent three weeks at Biarritz, writing there on the 19th the letter to Miss Blagden containing the familiar reference to *The Ring and the Book*, is substantiated by a passage in another letter to her from London dated "Oct. 19, '64": "I returned on the 11th. We stayed three weeks at Biarritz, . . . I hope to have a long poem ready by the summer, my Italian murder thing."

Besides information derived from letters in Mr. Wise's possession, I have recently found, at Baylor University, unpublished letters of Browning and Robert Lytton containing further allusions to Browning's stay at Pornic in 1862.

<sup>1a</sup> It was Miss Blagden's practice to write to Browning on the 12th of each month, while he replied on the 19th. This explains the frequent recurrence of the latter date in the correspondence cited.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, p. 65.

On his return to London, Browning found the desired manuscript awaiting him. On Oct. 18, '62, he writes to Miss Blagden from Warwick Crescent:

Thank you most truly for attending to my request so promptly, in the matter of the Account of the Murder &c. which I found on my return. Pray thank Mrs. Baker for her kindness, & say it will be particularly useful to me: it would be of little use to anybody without my documents, nor is it correct in several respects, but it contains a few notices of the execution &c. subsequent to my account that I can turn to good: I am going to make a regular poem of it.<sup>3</sup>

The query naturally arises; what was this manuscript account of the trial and execution of Count Francesco Guidi which Mrs. Baker sent to the poet in 1862? In addition to the Yellow Book, Browning is known to have used what Professor Hodel has called the Secondary Source, in the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. This was an Italian pamphlet, in manuscript, giving a contemporary version of the murder story, and supplementing the narrative of the Yellow Book with many important details.

A third document dealing with this famous trial was found in a library at Rome and has been printed by Professor Griffin in an English translation. But, as this manuscript was not discovered till after the poet's death, it is not one of his sources. The question, therefore, is, whether the document sent by Mrs. Baker to Browning is the Secondary Source, or a third source used by him, though unknown to us today.

The date of the discovery of the Secondary Source has been a matter of debate and uncertainty. As information derived solely from it is used freely in the first two cantos of *The Ring and the Book*, internal evidence shows that it was in Browning's hands before he began the composition of the poem. Mrs. Orr, who has translated certain passages from the manuscript in her *Handbook* to the poet's works, writes concerning it: "This pamphlet has supplied Mr. Browning with some of his most curious facts. It fell into his hands in London."<sup>4</sup> Professor C. W. Hodel refers more definitely to the discovery of the document: "It was found

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 68-9.

<sup>4</sup> Mrs. Sutherland Orr, *A Handbook to the Works of Robert Browning* (Ed. of 1923, London), footnote to p. 83.

in London by one of Browning's acquaintances, who, knowing the poet's interest in the subject, sent it to him."<sup>5</sup> Professor W. H. Griffin cites the following reminiscence, which may have a bearing on the date of the Secondary Source:

Mr. Cartwright, who spent a night or two at Warwick Crescent, about 1864 or '5, remembers that Browning then told him that he was engaged upon a poem based on the Franceschini affair, as to which, he added, he had procured further information: this would be that contained in a reprint of a contemporary manuscript pamphlet, sent him by a friend, containing an account of the murder and of Guidi's trial and execution.<sup>6</sup>

Mr. Arthur K. Cook, in *A Commentary upon Browning's The Ring and The Book*, has suggested a possible connection between the poet's letter to Frederic Leighton asking him for particulars about the church of San Lorenzo in Lucina, and the discovery of the Secondary Source.<sup>7</sup> As has been noted, the Secondary Source contains the account of the marriage of Pompilia and of the exposure of the bodies of the Comparini within the walls of this church. Mr. Cook, therefore, conjectures that Browning's request to Leighton on Oct. 17, 1864 was inspired by the finding of this important document. He also thinks that the discovery may account, in part, for the heightening of his interest in the subject matter of *The Ring and the Book* at this particular time. There is, however, no positive evidence to prove that the Secondary Source was sent to Browning in the year 1864. Mr. Cartwright's reminiscence of 1864 or 1865 does not state how long before that, the poet "procured further information" concerning "the Franceschini affair." Mr. Cook's connection of the finding of the Secondary Source with the letter to Lord Leighton, is in the nature of a surmise. On the other hand, Professor Hodell's statement that the manuscript was sent to Browning by an acquaintance of his who had found it in London, does not quite fit in with the theory that the document obtained by him from Mrs. Baker in 1862 was the Secondary Source. The manuscript owned by Mrs. Baker was sent to Browning from Florence, and reached him on

<sup>5</sup> See the preface to Professor Hodell's English translation of the Secondary Source in "Everyman's Library," 1911, p. 258.

<sup>6</sup> W. Hall Griffin, *The Life of Robert Browning*, p. 230.

<sup>7</sup> P. 277.



his return to London in October, 1862. Previous to this, the poet states, "she had lent it to Trollope, along with other documents which she thought might interest him." This was, presumably, not Anthony Trollope, the novelist, but his brother Thomas Adolphus Trollope, the author of a *History of Florence* and other works on Italian life of a biographical and historical character. He was a close friend both of Browning and Isa Blagden and made his home in Florence, having built a villa in the Piazza Indipendenza. It is, of course, possible that Mrs. Baker may have found the manuscript in London. But as she sent it to Browning from Florence, after it had been examined by Trollope, there is a strong presumption that it was discovered in Italy, as the nature of the document would lead us to expect. Such an assumption does not, however, disprove the identity of Mrs. Baker's manuscript with the Secondary Source. Professor Griffin and Sir Frederic Kenyon merely say that the Secondary Source was sent to the poet by a friend. Mrs. Orr's expression, "it fell into his hands in London," might readily have had its source in the dispatch of Mrs. Baker's document from Florence to Browning at Warwick Crescent, London. The detail added by Professor Hodell that "it was found in London," may easily be a slip.

The most important evidence, in this connection, lies in Browning's reference to the title and contents of Mrs. Baker's manuscript. When begging the loan of the document he calls it "a MS. account of the trial of Count Francesco Guidi for the murder of his wife." In acknowledging its receipt he refers to it as "the Account of the Murder &c." and tells Miss Blagden:

... it will be particularly useful to me: it would be of little use to anybody without my documents, nor is it correct in several respects, but it contains a few notices of the execution &c. subsequent to my account that I can turn to good. I am going to make a regular poem of it.\*

Browning's words, "it will be particularly useful to me," and his statement that, in conjunction with his other documents, he intends "to make a regular poem of it" are worthy of note. This establishes the fact that the account of the murder which he received from Mrs. Baker was used in the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. Since the Secondary Source is the only report of the trial

\* *Op. cit.*, pp. 68-69.



and execution of Guidi, in addition to the Yellow Book, that the poet is known to have used, it would seem a reasonable conjecture to identify this with Mrs. Baker's manuscript. The most direct and telling evidence, however, is comprised in the comment of Browning: "... it contains a few notices of the execution &c subsequent to my account that I can turn to good." This is in exact accord with the supplementary matter that the poet obtained from the Secondary Source, in writing *The Ring and the Book*. In Professor Hodel's English translation of the Secondary Source, published in "Everyman's Library,"<sup>o</sup> he has printed in italics the new material that Browning derived from it. The entire account of the execution at the end of the Secondary Source, containing about 350 words, is italicized. A comparison between this passage and the description of the execution of Guidi and his compatriots in *The Ring and the Book*, XII, 118-207, shows that the poet is following the Secondary Source almost verbatim. Browning's singling out of the notices of the execution in Mrs. Baker's manuscript as material that he "can turn to good" is, consequently, a strong argument in favour of the identification of this document with the Secondary Source.

WILLIAM O. RAYMOND.

*Bishop's University, Province of Quebec.*

---

THE GRAND SIGNIORS SERRAGLIO: WRITTEN BY  
MASTER ROBERT WITHERS

The dependence of much Elizabethan and Jacobean literature upon the published accounts of travellers to distant parts of the world has long been recognised and studied; but the travellers' accounts themselves have not in all instances been subjected to a careful scrutiny, and it is not surprising therefore that much plagiarism and some false attributions of authorship have passed unnoticed. A well-known description of the Turkish court which was published by two English editors three times in the course of the seventeenth century furnishes a case in point.

<sup>o</sup> Pp. 259-266.

*The Grand Signiors Serraglio: written by Master Robert Withers* was first printed in the second volume of *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, 1625. Twenty-five years later another version, full of changes and elaborations, was issued under the editorship of John Greaves with the title: *A Description of the Grand Signor's Seraglio, or Turkish Emperours Court*. A fresh edition of this was called for in 1653, and a careful reprint of the treatise took its place in the second volume of the *Miscellaneous Works of Mr. John Greaves*, London, 1737. Greaves does not mention the *Pilgrimes*, and seems not to have known that the *Description* had found an earlier editor. His text, certainly, does not rest upon the authority of Purchas, and there is no reason for doubting the good faith of his implication that his efforts had first brought the *Grand Signor's Seraglio* into public view.

Purchas introduces Withers' treatise with the following sentences:

... Here thou hast the Rarities of that Great Palace for the Matter and Arte, with the representation of the Turkish Court; the Rites prophane and devout, solemne and private of the Grand Signior and all his Grandes: the Sultanas, the Women and Virgins, the Sonnes and Daughters Royall, the Great Officers of State, and of the Houshold, their Courts, their admirable Discipline, with other Observations such as I thinke (for a great part of them) have not yet seene the publike light in any Language. These hath Master Robert Withers collected: after his ten yeeres observation at Constantinople, where he was educated by the care and cost of that late Honourable Embassadour from his Majestie, Sir Paul Pindar, and well instructed by Turkish Schoolemasters in the Language, and admitted also to further sight of their unholy Holies then is usuall. But why doe I hold thee longer from the Author himselfe; yea, from this promised Serraglio?<sup>1</sup>

In offering his *Description* 'to his Honoured, and truly Noble Friend, George Tooke, Esquire,' Greaves wrote as follows:

... I assume nothing to my self, either as Author of the discourse, or as Polisher of it; but onely an humble desire of publikely expressing my obligations to You. It was freely presented to me at *Constantinople*, and with the same freeness I recommend it to the Reader. The name of the Author being then unknown, upon inquiry I finde it since to be the worke of Mr. *Robert Withers*; who, by the favour of the English Ambassador, procuring admittance into the *Seraglio* (a curtesie unusuall) and by

<sup>1</sup> *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes* (a reprint of the first edition of 1625). Glasgow, 1905. ix, 321-22.

continuance many years in those parts, had time, and opportunity, to perfect his observations. To him therefore are solely due the thanks of the labour; to me it is sufficient that I have faithfully discharged my trust, in publishing since the Authors death, the fruits of his travails. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Now with regard to Robert Withers, whose name is so lightly touched upon in both these passages, the oracles are dumb. The available sources of biographical information supply no clue which goes beyond Greaves' account; and Greaves adds nothing to Purchas except the hint that Withers was dead in 1650. Those details which can be verified concern not Withers but his benefactor. Sir Paul Pindar, ambassador to Turkey from 1609-20, was renowned for his generosity in educating young men at his own 'care and cost,' and Robert Withers, as one of the recipients of this bounty, may well have learned the Turkish language, and even become a privileged observer of 'unholy Holies' under the nobleman's patronage. But however that may be, in the most important particular which they set down Purchas and Greaves were certainly mistaken. For Sir Paul's protégé was not the author of the treatise ascribed to him; he was, rather, the translator of an Italian manuscript which probably came into his hands during the years of his residence at Constantinople.

Of this manuscript several copies are extant, two being included in the Riant collection now in the possession of Harvard University. The better of these is in a very fair Italian hand, runs to 123 pages quarto, and bears as a title *Relatione del Serraglio del Gran Turco dell' Ill<sup>mo</sup> sig<sup>r</sup> Ottavian Bon Bailo Veneto*. The other, much less legible, is full of dialectic forms, runs to 223 pages quarto, and is labelled *Relat<sup>ne</sup> di Costantinopoli*, with 'par Bon, Bailo Veneto' added in a different ink.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>It will be noticed that Greaves does not specifically state that the *Description* came to his hands in manuscript form. But if he had been given a printed copy he would scarcely have remained in doubt concerning its authorship; nor, in all likelihood, would he have prided himself on 'communicating to the world' a work already published.

<sup>3</sup>Both these manuscripts contain considerable matter not printed in the version of Berchet. The first one mentioned above ends with an account of ceremonies connected with the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, a description of Turkish dress, and some remarks concerning Oriental sleeping customs. Some of these final paragraphs closely parallel others which occur earlier in the treatise. The second manuscript includes, at the end of the text

Working from other copies, Guglielmo Berchet edited and for the first time published Bon's treatise in Italian at Venice in 1865 under the title *Il Serraglio del Gransignore descritto da Ottaviano Bon, Bailo Veneto a Costantinopoli nell'anno 1608*. Subsequently it was issued among the *Relazioni lette al senato dagli ambasciatori veneti nel secolo XVI*, Serie V, Venezia, 1872.<sup>4</sup>

In a brief memoir prefixed to *Il Serraglio del Gransignore*, Berchet succinctly summarizes the important particulars of its author's life. Ottaviano Bon was ambassador from Venice to Spain, the Porte, and France successively. He was resident as Bailo in Constantinople from 1604-1608, and performed his duties there with distinction. Profiting by the excellent opportunities which his position afforded him for observing the state of the Ottoman court, he wrote not only his description of the seraglio, but also a *Saggio delle massime fondamentali del governo ottomano*.<sup>5</sup>

Withers' English version does not correspond exactly with the text printed by Berchet, nor with either of the manuscripts in the Riant collection, and the three Italian versions by no means precisely agree with each other. The differences are not, however, large, and may be briefly described.

To Withers, apparently, is due the division of the work into chapters and the addition of suitable chapter-headings. Probably he added very little else, though one short anecdote and a comment or two which are nowhere paralleled in the Italian seem to have been original contributions.<sup>6</sup> The translation is fairly close, and mistranslations are not numerous. Only occasionally did the Englishman allow himself the liberty of transposing, expanding, or condensing.<sup>7</sup> A few Italian words he took over without change,

proper, several pages of notes and tables dealing with the accounts and officials of the Ottoman realm. My thanks are due to Professor G. B. Weston, who generously aided me in deciphering some parts of the manuscripts.

<sup>4</sup> Berchet knew of manuscript copies in the library of Count Manin and the library of Count Recanati. He does not tell upon what copy he based his text.

<sup>5</sup> Printed in the *Relazioni lette al senato*, Serie V, I, 116 ff.

<sup>6</sup> The anecdote is found in Purchas, IX, 401: "I remember once," etc. The comment (p. 370) on Turkish doctors, "Neither doe I hold their skill sufficient to prepare Medicines for every Maladie," is Withers' own.

<sup>7</sup> For examples of transposition, cf. Purchas' text, p. 324, paragraph

but whenever occasion demanded he was careful to convert Italian terms into equivalents which would be more readily understood by his readers.<sup>8</sup> The greatest discrepancies occur in the statement of numbers, and there is considerable variation in the lists of officers and supplies.<sup>9</sup>

It is impossible to speak with complete assurance regarding the changes made by Withers because of the impossibility of reconstructing in detail the text from which he worked. The most satisfactory way of gaining an idea concerning the relation between the English and Italian versions is to read and compare typical parallel passages selected from them. Here is an excerpt from Withers' final chapter, in which he treats of Turkish 'Religion, Opinions, Persons, Times, Places and Rites Sacred':

They also affirme Gods Power to bee such, that after mens Bodies are risen againe, hee will give them such an agilitie, that they shall bee able in a moment to passe from one Heaven to another, even to the farthest parts of them, to visite and imbrace their Wives, Mothers, Brothers, and others of their Kindred, the Heavens being all transparent, being of Diamonds, Rubies, Turkesses and Christall.

---

2, with Berchet, p. 14; Purchas, p. 381 (beginning of Chap. x) with Berchet, p. 53; Purchas, p. 402, end of paragraph 2, with Berchet, p. 65. The enlargements which might be credited to Withers on the basis of Berchet's text have, in each of the dozen cases examined, full *manuscript* authority. For apparent omissions cf. Purchas, p. 335, last paragraph, with Berchet, pp. 22-23; Purchas, p. 405, with Berchet, p. 67. The omissions in Withers' translation are in general trifling.

<sup>8</sup> Withers uses 'alla mutasca' several times, e. g., on p. 363. The 'Bailo of Venice' appears on p. 376. But '7 in 8000 cillò, che può essere in circa stara 3000 veneziane' becomes 'seven or eight thousand Keeloes, which makes almost so many Bushels of ours here in London,' p. 376.

<sup>9</sup> A few examples will suffice: Purchas, p. 326, 'thirtie, or thirtie-five very brave Horses'; Berchet, p. 16, '25 in 30 cavalli.' Purchas, p. 338, 'about two thousand persons men and women, whereof the women . . . may bee about eleven or twelve hundred'; Berchet, p. 24, 'fra uomini e donne il numero di 5000: le donne saranno da 3000 in circa.' Purchas, p. 357, 'eight Aspers per diem'; Berchet, p. 37, '40 aspri al giorno'; Purchas, p. 390, 'seven Wives'; Berchet, p. 56, 'quattro mogli.' The list of officials given by Withers in his sixth chapter, p. 358, varies considerably from that in Berchet, p. 38. Both the manuscript versions are at this point nearer to Withers' account, though they do not exactly parallel it, or each other. The lists in Withers' ninth chapter, p. 379, in Berchet, p. 52, and the manuscripts, are in closer, though not in precise, agreement.

As concerning Gods Throne or Seate of Majestie; they affirme, that every one cannot behold it, by reason of the brightnesse of the beames which comes from his Eyes, and by reason of the unspeakeable splendour proceeding from his glorious Face, and that the Angels and Prophets onely, have the grace to enjoy that sight.

These are the principall foundations of their Religion, upon which they build the course of this their present temporall Life, and by which they hope to obtaine a Life everlasting and happie; affirmed by their Prophet, to bee full of the delights and pleasures of this World, but enjoyed in all perfection and excellencie, in a Supernaturall and Incorruptible manner.

They say, that Almighty God sent foure Prophets into the World, to instruct, governe, and save Mankind; each of them being holy, pure, and undefiled, to wit, Moses, David, Christ, and Mahomet; and that God sent to every one of them by his Angell Gabriell a Booke, that they themselves being first perfected, might the better know how to instruct the people. To Moses he sent the Teurat, that is, the Old Law; to David the Zebur, that is, the Psalmes; to Christ the Ingil, that is, the Gospell; and to Mahomet the Kurawn, that is, the Alcoran (as wee call it.) And that the three first Prophets with their people, did faile somewhat in the Lawes given them by God: But Mahomet comming last, brought a Law, more true, plaine, cleere, and sincere, in which all such as beleeve should obtayne the love of God; but they say that other Nations continue still in their errors, and having sucked of their Mothers Milke, doe not embrace the Truth; For which fault being (by right) deprived of Heaven, they have no other meanes to recover, and to come thither at the Day of Judgement, but by Mahomets protection, who is the only Intercessor and Mediator unto the Almighty God: And standing in the dreadfull Day of Judgement at the gate of Paradise, he shall be sought unto and entreated by the other Prophets to save their people also, and his clemencie shall be such, as to make Intercession for them, so that the good Christians and the good Jewes shall by his meanes obtayne everlasting Life, with perpetuities of sensuall delights as aforesaid, but in a place apart and inferiour to the Turkes, they being beloved of God, and more deare unto him then others. The women also shall come into Heaven, but shall be in a place farre inferiour to men, and be lesse glorified.

All the Prophets are held in great honour amongst them. They call Moses, Musahib Alloh, that is, a talker with God; and Christ, Meseeh, Rooh-ulloh, and Hazrette Isaw, that is, Messias, the Spirit of God, and venerable Jesus: and Mahomet, Resul Alloh, that is, the Messenger of God. When they talke of Christ Jesus, they speake very reverently of him; and confesse that the Jewes through Envie apprehended him, and maliciously condemned him, and led him along to put him to death; but the Angels being sent from God, tooke him away from them in a Cloud, and carried him into Heaven, at which the Jewes being astonished and vexed, tooke one that was there present, and crucified him in his stead; not being willing to have it knowne that Jesus was the Messias; he being in



Heaven in company of his Brethern the Prophets, beloved of God, and serving him, as the other Prophets doe.<sup>10</sup>

These are the corresponding paragraphs from Berchet's edition, pp. 59-61, with a few variants supplied from the manuscripts in the Riant collection; the better manuscript being designated by 'A', the other by 'B':

Affermano l'ampiezza grande dei cieli, che sono di diamante, di rubini, di turchine e di cristallo, che li corpi resuscitati saranno trasparenti puri, agili, ed atti in un momento a passare da un cielo all'altro, ed a transferirsi in lontanissime parti, per visitare ed abbracciare le mogli, li padri e madri, fratelli ed altri parenti.

Del trono d'Iddio presente a tutto, e dell' assistenza e servizio degli angeli e profeti, come si dirà, rappresentano quello di che è incapace il senso e l' intelligenza umana, afirmando, che non possi esser veduto così facilmente da tutti per la lucidezza delli raggi che gli usciranno dalli occhi e per il gran splendore che manderà fuori della sua faccia, e che solo gli angeli e profeti hanno grazia di tal fruizione.

Questi sono li fondamenti principali della loro credenza, sopra i quali fabbricano il corso della loro vita temporale e corruttibile, per conseguire l'eterna, felice ed affermata dal profeta esser ripiena di tutte le delizie di questo mondo, usate in tutta eccellenza e perfezione con modo sopranaturale ed incorruttibile.

Dicono, che tra li profeti sono stati quattro li principali mandati da Dio nel mondo per instruire, reggere e salvare il genere umano, e tutti uomini santi, puri ed immacolati: cioè Moisè, David, Cristo e Maometto; che a tutti mandò Dio per mano delli angeli un libro, perchè documentati sapessero instruire li popoli. A Moisè mandò il Pentateuco, a David li Salmi, a Cristo l'Evangeliò, ed a Maometto l'Alcorano; che li tre primi profeti con li popoli retti da loro non errarono per essere instruiti nelle leggi date loro da Dio, ma che essendo venuto per ultimo Maometto per salvare tutti con una legge candida, sincera e veridica per acquistar l'amor di Iddio: hanno errato, e tuttavia continuano nell'errore le nazioni, che seguendo il latte materno, non si sono accostate alla verità, e che per tal mancamento, essendo prive (ipso iure) del cielo avranno bisogno nel giorno del giudizio, se dovranno per grazia entrare fra li beati, della protezione di Maometto intercessore unico ed immediato presso il grande Iddio, il quale alla porta del paradiso, stando in quel tremendo giorno sarà pregato dagli altri profeti, ognuno per la salute della loro nazione, e che sarà così potente e benigna la volontà di lui, che intercederà col Salvatore la loro salute, sì che li buoni cristiani e li buoni ebrei, conseguiranno l'uso della vita eterna nelle delizie perpetue sensuali, come s'è detto, ma in luoco separato ed inferiore a' turchi, come privilegiati e cari sopra li altri a Dio. Le

<sup>10</sup> *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, IX, 395-396.



donne saranno ancor esse ammesse in cielo, ma in luoco inferiore agli uomini, e con minor gloria.

Tutti li profeti sono tenuti da loro in gran venerazione, chiamano Moisè parlator di Dio, David laudator d'Iddio, Cristo nominato anco Messia spirito di Dio. Quando parlano di Cristo, dicono tutto quel bene che si può dire d'un uomo eletto da Dio per salute del popolo; confessano che per invidia fu preso dalli ebrei e che per loro malignità lo fecero condannare e lo condussero al patibolo della morte per esser crocifisso; ma che essendo stati mandati da Dio gli angeli in una densa nube, fosse stato rapito e portato in cielo, e che detti ebrei confusi, presero uno di loro e lo crocifissero in luoco di lui, divulgando che quel tale era il Messia, che però si ritrovava in compagnia delli altri suoi fratelli profeti in cielo, animandosi e compiacendosi nel servizio di Dio.

trasparenti, etc. (A) trasparenti, etc. (B) trasparentti piu agglili piu atti.

le padri (B) omits.

e corruttibile . . . incorruttibile (B) omits.

l'eterna, felice, etc. (A) l'eterna felicità, afirmando esser quella piena perchè documentati (A) accioche ammaestrati (B) p li documentti.

li pentateuco (A) Teruat, cioe la legge uecchia (B) la legge uecchia.

li Salmi (A) il Zebur, cioe li salmi (B) gli salmi.

l'Evangelio (A) l'Ingil, cioe l'euangelio (B) l'euangelio.

l'Alcorano (A) il Turcan ch'e l'Alcorano (B) il turchan cioe il ancorano.

retti da loro non errarono, etc. (A) retti da loro nō errorno per esser uisutti (B) da loro creatti n̄ erano p essere uisutti.

entrare . . . beati (B) omits.

immediato presso (A) imediato appresso (B) mediatore, presso.

ognuno, etc. (A) ciascuno per la sua natione, et salute di quella.

si che li buoni cristiani, etc. (A) si che li buoni ebrei conseguirano l'uso della uita eterna nelle delitie perpetue sensuali, come anco li buoni Cristiani (B) si che gli buoni Cristiani et gli buoni ebrei conseguirano l'uno, et gli altri della uitta eterna nelle delitie perpetue sensuale come si e detto.

chiamano . . . popolo (B) omits, adding 'Cristo' before 'fu.'

Moisè (A) Moise Chelimetala.

David (A) David Ambdulla.

Messia (A) Messia Russulla, cioe spirito di Dio, et Macometto Russullalla, cioe nontio di Dio.

che però si ritrovava (A) il qual percio si trono (B) che pero si trona.

In conclusion, a word must be said about the text published by Greaves. All the matter printed by Purchas, with some changes of phrase and some modernization of spelling, is included in *A Description of the Grand Signor's Seraglio*. But in this later version, particularly in the latter chapters, there are considerable

elaborations. Many Turkish terms, with marginal glosses, are inserted, and many paragraphs are lengthened by the addition of new material. The passage quoted above, for example, is embellished and rearranged as follows:

. . . so that the Angels, and Prophets only, have the grace to enjoy that sight. And of the angels they report thus, that they are continually serving, and praising God, and ready to obey his will: but I have read in a book which they call *Ahvaulee keeyawmet*, that is, the state of the day of judgement; written by a famous *Sheyk* amongst them, a most ridiculous discourse of the Angel *Gabriel*. For he writes, that *Gabriel* hath a thousand six hundred wings, and that he is hairy from head to foot, of a saffron colour, having in his forehead a sun, and upon every hair a star; and that he dives three hundred and sixty times a day into *Noor dengiz*, and ever as he riseth out of the water he shakes himself, and of every drop that falls from him there is an angel made, after the likeness of *Gabriel* himself; who untill the end of the world do pray unto God, and praise him, upon their beads; and these young angels are called *Roohawneyoon*. Many such discourses there are in that book; but because they are vain I leave them to the Turks that beleieve them, especially the common sort, who think that whatsoever is written in their tongue must of necessity be true, and that they are bound to beleieve it.

They hold that in Paradise there is a tree which they call *Toobaw*, upon whose leaves are written the names of every living man; so when Gods will is that such, or such a one should die, God shakes off his leaf into Israels lap, who looks upon it, and reads it, & having seen what Gods pleasure is, he (after the party hath been dead forty days) sends an angel to carry his soul, according as the leaf shal direct him, either into heaven, or hel, for upon his leaf, not only his hower of death is written, but also what shall become of him after he is dead.

They say, that Almighty God sent four *Pegambers*, that is Prophets, into the world, to instruct, govern, and save mankinde, each of them being holy, pure, and undefiled, viz: *Moosaw*: *Dawood*: *Isaw*: and *Muhammed*: . . .

All the Prophets are held in great honor amongst them, and they never name any Prophet but they say *Aleyhoo selawm* that is health, or salutation be upon him.

They call Moses, *Musahib Alloh* that is, a *Talker with God*; and David *Hazrettee Dawood*, that is, *venerable David*, and Jesus *Meseeh*, *Roohullah*, and *Hazrettee Isaw*, that is *Messias*, *the spirit of God*, and *Venerable Jesus*; and *Mahomet*, *Resul Alloh*, that is, *the Messenger of God*.

When they talk of Christ Jesus, they speak very reverently of him . . .

These are the main, and principall foundations of their Religion.<sup>11</sup> . . .

<sup>11</sup> *A Description of the Grand Signor's Seraglio*, London, 1650. Pp.

These improvements are probably not due to Greaves, who would in all likelihood have claimed the credit if he had been responsible for them. They were doubtless the work of the translator, or of some copier of his manuscript at Constantinople who took advantage of the opportunity for employing a superior knowledge of the Turkish language and beliefs.

WARNER G. RICE.

Harvard University.

### NACHTRÄGE ZU HOLTEIS BRIEFE AN TIECK

Obgleich Karl von Holteis *Briefe an Tieck* schon im Jahre 1864 erschienen, müssen sie noch immer als die weitaus beste Briefquelle für Ludwig Tiecks Leben und Schaffen betrachtet werden. Im Laufe meiner Beschäftigung mit Tieck, die häufigen Gebrauch von Holteis Sammlung voraussetzte, sind mir in diesem Werke eine ganze Reihe von Mängeln, Irrtümern und bemerkenswerten Punkten aufgefallen. Einige von diesen möchte ich hier als Nachträge anführen und besprechen. Ich beobachte dabei die von Holtei gewahrte alphabetische Reihenfolge.

1. Band I, 27. Auguste, die Holtei scheinbar nicht zu identifizieren vermag, ist Auguste Böhmer, Karolinens Kind aus erster Ehe und das Stiefkind August Wilhelm Schlegels. Waitz<sup>1</sup> und Schmidt<sup>1</sup> datieren beide diese Versepistel "Jena, im März oder April 1799". Friedrichs Antwort darauf befindet sich bei Waitz a. a. O. I, 372.

2. Band I, 41. Selbst dem flüchtigen Leser von Holtei muss es auffallen, dass der erste Brief von Beskow, am 28. Februar 1835 in Stockholm geschrieben, viel formeller ist als der zweite (S. 53), der vom Juni desselben Jahres und gleichfalls aus Stockholm stammt. Die sieben darauffolgenden gleichen in dieser Hinsicht eher dem zweiten als dem ersten. Im ersten bedient sich der Schreiber des förmlichen "Sie," in den übrigen Beskow-Briefen

169-174. No attempt has been made to record all the small variations in phraseology.

<sup>1</sup> G. Waitz, *Caroline*, Leipzig 1871, I, 250. E. Schmidt, *Caroline*, Berlin 1913, I, 531-533.

wird Tieck geduzt. Indessen ist nichts davon bekannt, dass die Freundschaft Tiecks und Beskows zwischen Februar und Juni 1835 besonders intim geworden wäre. Es stellt sich heraus, dass der erste Brief überhaupt nicht an Beskow, sondern an Carl Gustav Brinkman gerichtet ist. Das Original befindet sich jetzt in der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek zu Dresden und trägt deutlich die Unterschrift "v. Brinkman". Offenbar hatte sich Holtei verlesen. Im Jahre 1917 veröffentlichte O. Fiebiger den Brief wieder,<sup>2</sup> diesmal als ein Schreiben von Brinkman, ohne jedoch zu wissen, dass er bereits bei Holtei unter einem falschen Verfasser erschienen war. Später entdeckte Fiebiger sowohl sein eigenes Versehen wie auch Holteis Irrtum und machte darauf aufmerksam.<sup>3</sup> Die übrigen acht Briefe jedoch, die bei Holtei folgen (S. 53-63), stammen tatsächlich aus Beskows Feder.

3. Band I, 123. Dieser erste undatierte Brief von Carus wird wahrscheinlich ins Jahr 1840 gehören, zumal die darin erwähnte Novelle *Waldeinsamkeit* in der *Urania* für 1841, das heisst 1840 erschien.

4. Band I, 127. Es soll Nr. V, nicht VI heissen, und der Brief auf S. 128 soll Nr. VI sein. Der hier erwähnte von Gar wird auch in einem Brief von Tieck an Carus, der sich in meinem Besitz befindet,<sup>4</sup> erwähnt. Mein Tieck-Brief stellt die Antwort auf diesen Carus-Brief dar.

5. Band I, 239 ff. Diese vier Goethe-Briefe an Tieck müssen durch neue Auffindungen ergänzt werden. Leider hat aber keine vorhandene Sammlung des Goethe-Tieck-Briefwechsels Vollständigkeit erzielt. Selbst die Sammlung von Schüddekopf und Walzel<sup>5</sup> übersieht einen Brief Goethes an Tieck. Das folgende Verzeichnis führt die sämtlichen uns bekannten Briefe an, die Goethe und Tieck wechselten.

Zuerst Tiecks Briefe an Goethe: 10. Juni 1798—S-W 290-291; 6. Juni 1800—S-W 292; 9. Juni 1800—S-W 292; 9. Dezember 1801—S-W 293-294; 24. Dezember 1819—S-W 297-299; 27.

<sup>2</sup> Im *Literarischen Echo*, XIX, 9.

<sup>3</sup> Im *Euphorion*, Ergänzungsheft 13 (1921), S. 62.

<sup>4</sup> Vgl. *Modern Language Notes*, XLIII, 2 (Februar 1928), S. 76-77.

<sup>5</sup> *Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft*, 13. Bd., Weimar 1898. Die Sammlung ist im folgenden als S-W bezeichnet.

März 1822—S-W 301-302; 24. Dezember 1823—S-W 302-304; 6. September 1824—S-W 307; 5. Oktober 1824—S-W 308; 30. August 1829—S-W 309-311; 24. September 1829—S-W 312.

Dann Goethes Briefe an Tieck: Juli 1798 (Konzept)—S-W 291; 8. Juni 1800—in S-W ausgelassen, doch siehe *Weim. Ausg.* IV. Abt., 18, S. 80-81, Nr. 4254<sup>a</sup>; 16. Dezember 1801 (?) (Konzept)—S-W 295-296, wurde nicht abgeschickt; 17. Dezember 1801—S-W 296-297; 23. Januar 1820 (Konzept)—S-W 299-301, wurde erst am 2. Februar abgeschickt; 2. Januar 1824—S-W 304-306, Nr. II bei Holtei; 9. Mai 1824—S-W 306, Nr. III bei Holtei; 9. September 1829—S-W 311-312, Nr. IV bei Holtei.

6. Band I, 245. Brief Nr. II von Grabbe trägt dasselbe Datum wie Nr. III, nämlich den 29. August 1823. Jedenfalls ist der eine oder der andere als Konzept zu betrachten. In seiner Ausgabe von Grabbes Werken (1902) druckt Grisebach jedoch beide ab und erweckt denselben falschen Eindruck, den Holtei schon durch seine Bemerkung S. 243 hervorgerufen hatte.

7. Band I, 258. Tiecks Antwortschreiben auf diesen Brief von Gries ist am 28. April 1829 datiert und wurde im *Weimarischen Jahrbuch* III (1855), S. 205, abgedruckt.

8. Band I, 304. In seinen Romantiker-Briefen (Jena 1907) druckt Gundolf diesen Brief an Hardenberg zum grössten Teil ab und datiert ihn richtig 1799. Was den Text anbelangt, so ist Gundolf aber hier wie auch sonst unzuverlässig. Er revidiert, verbessert und lässt zuweilen sogar einzelne Wendungen aus.

9. Band I, 332 ff. Ausser diesen zwei Briefen von Hebbel veröffentlicht R. M. Werner in seiner Ausgabe von Hebbels Briefen noch zwei andere, einen vom 28. April 1840 und einen anderen vom 12. Januar 1841.

10. Band II, 43 ff. Diese drei Briefe von Iffland liegen mit vielen geringfügigen Textabweichungen auch bei F. Dingelstedt, *Teichmanns literarischer Nachlass* <sup>6</sup> vor. Offenbar benutzte Holtei die Originale, während Dingelstedt die Konzepte abdruckte. Ein Operettentext war nicht die Ursache jener Spannung, die zwischen Iffland und Tieck herrschte, wie Holtei irrtümlicherweise behauptet (Anm. S. 43). Es handelt sich vielmehr um Tiecks *Genoveva*.

<sup>6</sup> Stuttgart 1863, S. 292 ff.

11. Band II, 83. Der von Tieck "sehr hochgeschätzte Schauspieler Herr P.", den Tieck hier Immermann gegenüber erwähnt, ist der Schauspieler Porth, wie ein Brief Dorothea Tiecks an Uechtritz vom 27. Juli 1835<sup>7</sup> eindeutig beweist.

12. Band II, 152. Im Zusammenhang mit Justinus Kerner's Brief vom 14. Juni 1841 vergleiche man Tiecks Brief an ihn vom 3. Juli.<sup>8</sup>

13. Band II, 359. Das Original dieses Briefes von Mnioc habe ich mit Holteis Fassung vergleichen können. Im ganzen darf diese als eine getreue Abschrift betrachtet werden. Mit einigen Lesarten jedoch kann ich nicht übereinstimmen. So lese ich z. B. statt "Nikolaiten" (S. 360, 7. Zeile von unten) "Nikolaitana"; statt "Anzug" (S. 361, 8. Zeile von unten) "Aufzug"; und statt "jüngeren" (S. 364, 6. Zeile von unten) "innigeren". In allen diesen Fällen handelt es sich aber nur um die richtige Entzifferung von Mnioc's Handschrift.

14. Band III, 223 ff. Holtei druckt 38 Briefe von Wilhelm Schlegel an Tieck ab. Doch ist es äusserst zweifelhaft, ob der erste (S. 224-225) überhaupt Wilhelm zuzuschreiben ist. Auf diese 38 Briefe folgen 16 von Friedrich und 2 von Dorothea Schlegel. Professor Henry Lüdeke-St. Gallen in der Schweiz besorgt gegenwärtig eine Ausgabe des vollständigen vorhandenen Briefwechsels zwischen Tieck und den Brüdern Schlegel, worin auch einige Briefe von Tieck an Dorothea und umgekehrt aufgenommen werden sollen. Die Originale befinden sich in der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek. Lüdekes Arbeit ist zur Zeit (März 1928) im Manuskript fertig.

15. Band IV, 44 ff. Diese drei Briefe von Solger, die alle aus dem Jahre 1811 stammen, gehören zu den ersten Solgerschen Schreiben an Tieck. Vierzig andere, aus den Jahren 1811-1819, liegen mehr oder minder vollständig in *Solgers Nachgelassenen Schriften und Briefwechsel* herausgegeben von Ludwig Tieck und Fr. von Raumer<sup>9</sup> vor. Dieses Werk enthält gleichfalls dreissig mehr oder minder vollständige Briefe von Tieck an Solger.

<sup>7</sup> In den *Erinnerungen an Fr. v. Uechtritz und seine Zeit*, Leipzig 1884, S. 196.

<sup>8</sup> In L. H. Fischer's Werk *Aus Berlins Vergangenheit*, Berlin 1891; vgl. ferner T. Kerner, *Justinus Kerner's Briefwechsel mit seinen Freunden*, Stuttgart und Leipzig 1897.

<sup>9</sup> 1. Bd., Leipzig 1826, S. 214 ff.



16. Band IV, 103. Ich besitze eine Abschrift von Tiecks Antwort auf diesen Brief des amerikanischen Gelehrten George Ticknor. Tiecks Schreiben datiert aus dem Oktober des Jahres 1844.

17. Band IV, 104 ff. Holtei teilt zehn Briefe von Uechtritz an Tieck und zwei von Tieck an Uechtritz mit. Die beiden letzteren Schreiben sind auch in den *Erinnerungen an Fr. v. Uechtritz und seine Zeit* (S. 147 ff.) abgedruckt, wo auch noch vier weitere Briefe von Tieck an denselben Adressaten (vom 24. August 1827; 5. Januar 1846; 18. März 1846 und 21. März 1847) zu finden sind. Vergleicht man die Holteische Fassung der beiden von ihm mitgeteilten Tieck-Briefe mit der des Uechtritz-Bandes, so findet man nicht nur wichtige Verschiedenheiten im Text, sondern auch Unterschiede im Datum. Holtei datiert den ersten (S. 108) am 10. Dezember 1825 und den zweiten (S. 109) am 11. Februar 1827, während im Uechtritz-Bande bzw. der 12. Dezember und der 14. Februar stehen. Ich hege keinen Zweifel, dass Holtei nur die Konzepte vorlagen.

18. Band IV, 167. Brief Nr. IV, aus der Feder von Willisens stammend, gehört nicht unter Waagens Namen und müsste somit auf S. 309 eingeschaltet werden.

19. Band IV, 169 ff. Diese sechzehn Briefe von Wackenroder an Tieck sind jetzt in von der Leyens Ausgabe der *Werke und Briefe Wackenroders*<sup>10</sup> bequemer nachzuschlagen. Von der Leyen nimmt auch Wackenroders Brief vom 1. September 1792 auf (S. 103), der Holtei noch nicht bekannt war und zum ersten Male im *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*<sup>11</sup> veröffentlicht wurde. Er muss auf S. 212 in Holteis Sammlung, zwischen Nr. X und XI, eingeschaltet werden.

20. Holteis Sammlung enthält neun Briefe von Tieck, nämlich zwei an Braniss; je einen an Immermann, Friederike Krickeberg und Reichardt; und je zwei an Uechtritz und Gustav Waagen.

21. Ausser den oben unter 5), 9), 14), 15) und 19) erwähnten Briefen von Goethe, Hebbel, den Schlegel, Solger und Wackenroder, die von Holtei nicht aufgenommen wurden aber in anderen neueren Quellen vorliegen, sind mir die mit Angabe des Verfassers,

<sup>10</sup> 2. Bd., Jena 1910.

<sup>11</sup> 126. Bd., S. 229. Es scheint von der Leyen entgangen zu sein, dass dieser Brief bereits im *Archiv* mitgeteilt worden war.

des Datums und der Quelle folgenden anderswo gedruckten Briefe an Tieck bekannt: Arnim, 18. Februar 1809 (*Euphorion* Ergh. 15, 1923, S. 67); Burgsdorff, 15. Mai 1799 (*Deut. Literaturdenkmale* 139, S. 166); Fr. von Raumer, etwa 76 Briefe aus den Jahren 1818-1841 (*Lebenserinnerungen u. Briefwechsel v. Fr. v. Raumer*, 2 Bde., Leip. 1861; *Literar. Nachlass v. Fr. v. Raumer*, 2 Bde., Berl. 1869; siehe auch *Hamb. Nachr.* Beil. v. 11. April 1915); P. O. Runge, 4 Briefe aus den Jahren 1802-1807 (*Hinterlass. Schr. v. P. O. Runge* hrsg. v. dessen Bruder, Hamburg 1840-1841); Friedrich Tieck, 2 Briefe: 1834 u. 1846 (F. Hildebrandt, *Fr. Tieck*, Leip. 1907, S. 170 ff.); Sophie Tieck, 8. November 1804 (ebendasselbst, S. 161).<sup>12</sup>

Ungedruckte Briefe an Tieck befinden sich in Berlin, in Dresden und an mehreren anderen Orten.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

*University of Cincinnati.*

#### DAS WORT 'PHYSIOLOGISCH' BEI GOETHE

Wer in Goethes kritischen Schriften schärfer auf die Bedeutung des einzelnen Wortes oder Ausdrucks achtet, wird bald bemerken, daß Goethe mit einer gewissen selbstherrlichen Nachlässigkeit vorgeht, wie sie dem Grand Seigneur eigen ist. Das gilt besonders vom älteren Goethe. Jedoch verbirgt sich häufiger hinter dieser scheinbaren Nachlässigkeit ein tieferer Sinn. In dieser Hinsicht ist ein Ausspruch Goethes aus dem Jahre 1817 von Bedeutung. In *Über Kunst und Altertum* heisst es: "Die Muttersprache zugleich reinigen und bereichern ist das Geschäft der besten Köpfe; Reinigung ohne Bereicherung erweist sich öfters geistlos: denn es ist nichts bequemer, als vom Inhalt absehen und auf den Ausdruck

<sup>12</sup> Es ist noch nachzutragen, dass der am 21. VIII 36 datierte Brief von Hallwachs (Holtei I, 300) durch Tiecks Brief vom 30. VIII (*Archiv f. hess. Gesch. u. Altertumskunde*, N. F. 11 (1916), 282) beantwortet wurde. Auch mache ich auf vier weitere Briefe an Tieck aufmerksam: von Dorothea Schlegel, Wien, 13. IV 29 (F. Deibel, *Palästra* 40, 1905); 2 von Holtei, 1839 (Holtei, *Briefe aus und nach Grafenort*, Altona 1841); und von Öhlenschläger, undatiert (Sergel, *Ö. in s. persönl. Beziehungen zu Goethe, Tieck und Hebbel*, Rostock 1907, S. 66).

passen. Der geistreiche Mensch knetet seinen Wortstoff, ohne sich zu bekümmern, aus was für Elementen er bestehe; der geistlose hat gut *rein* sprechen, da er nichts zu sagen hat. Wie sollte er fühlen, welches kümmerliche Surrogat er an der Stelle eines bedeutenden Wortes gelten läßt, da ihm jenes Wort nie lebendig war, weil er nichts dabei dachte." (J. A. 37, 95.) Dieser Ausspruch ist besonders bei Goethes Gebrauch von Fremdwörtern zu beachten.

Bei der Durchsicht der in Spingarns *Goethe's Literary Essays* zusammengestellten Übersetzungen fiel mir in der kleinen Abhandlung *Über epische und dramatische Dichtung* ein Satz auf, dessen Bedeutung mir dunkel blieb und wo alle Kommentare versagten. "Die sittliche (Welt)," heisst es, "ist beiden (d. h. der epischen und der dramatischen Dichtung) ganz gemein und wird am glücklichsten in ihrer physiologischen und pathologischen Einfalt dargestellt." (J. A. 36, 151.) Man sieht auf den ersten Blick, daß physiologisch hier nicht in seiner gewöhnlichen Bedeutung steht. Aber was heisst dann der Satz: "Die sittliche Welt wird am glücklichsten in ihrer physiologischen Einfalt dargestellt?"

Die Zusammenstellung von physiologisch und pathologisch, von Physiologie und Pathologie findet man bei Goethe leidlich häufig. Nun aber ist, in der technischen Bedeutung, die Physiologie die Lehre von dem gesunden Körper, die Pathologie die Lehre von Krankheiten. So sagt auch Goethe: "Wer würde eine Physiologie durch pathologische Noten zu entkräften glauben!" d. h. die Lehre vom normalen, naturgemäßen Körper läßt sich nicht durch Hinweise auf krankhafte Erscheinungen entkräften. (*Diderots Versuch über die Malerei*, J. A. 33, 219.) In derselben Abhandlung sagt Goethe, daß der Physiolog eine abnorme Gestalt nicht gebrauchen kann, "denn sie stellt die menschliche Gestalt nicht im Durchschnitt dar" (211). Er bestreitet so die Berechtigung von Diderots Neigung, Natur und Kunst zu amalgamieren: "Er verlangt eigentlich vom Künstler, daß er für Physiologie und Pathologie arbeiten solle, eine Aufgabe, die das Genie wohl schwerlich übernehmen würde" (211). In der Farbenlehre teilt Goethe die subjektiven Farbenempfindungen in physiologische und pathologische: jene sind dem gesunden, diese dem kranken Auge eigen (Weimarer Ausgabe, II, 1, S. 2). In den *Annalen für das Jahr 1811* heisst es: "Eine Wissenschaft ist, wie jede menschliche Anstalt und Einrichtung, eine ungeheure Kontingation von Wahrem und Falschem, von

Freiwilligem und Notwendigem, von Gesundem und Krankhaftem; alles, was wir tagtäglich gewahr werden, dürfen wir am Ende doch nur als Symptome ansehen, die, wenn wir uns wahrhaft ausbilden wollen, auf ihre physiologischen und pathologischen Prinzipie zurückzuführen sind" (J. A. 30, 261). Hier bedeutet physiologisch gesund, normal, naturgemäfs. Man beachte die parallele Wortstellung: gesund—krank, wahr—falsch, physiologisch—pathologisch. Wie bildhaft konkret ist das ungewöhnliche Fremdwort Kontignation, wenn man es in seiner ursprünglichen Bedeutung erfafst: ein Miteinander- oder Zusammenbauen. Ganz so gebraucht Goethe das Wort physiologisch! In den *Schriften zur Botanik* empfiehlt Goethe, damit der guten Sache nicht geschadet werde, dafs man "von der eigentlichen, gesunden, physiologisch-reinen Metamorphose" ausgehe. Und nur wenige Zeilen weiter heifst es: "Im Pflanzenreiche nennt man . . . das Normale in seiner Vollständigkeit mit Recht ein Gesundes, ein physiologisch Reines" (J. A. 39, 338). So definiert hier Goethe selber: das Normale in seiner Vollständigkeit ist das Gesunde, ist das physiologisch Reine. In dieser selben Bedeutung gebraucht er auch das Wort physiolog oder physiologisch von der geistigen oder der sittlichen Welt. Auch da ist das Normale, das Gesunde, das Naturgemäfe das Physiologische. An Johanna Schopenhauers Roman *Gabriele* lobt er: "Einsichtige Anthropologie, sittliche physiologische Ansichten, sogar durch Familien und Generationen durchgeführt" (J. A. 37, 226). Hier kann physiolog nur der gesunden, normalen Natur gemäfs bedeuten. Von hier aus fällt auch ein kleines Streiflicht auf den berühmten Ausspruch über die Romantik: "Das Klassische nenne ich das Gesunde, und das Romantische das Kranke" (Zu Eckermann, d. 2. April 1829). Klassisch ist, was der ewigen Norm entspricht: romantisch, was davon abweicht. Für die von Spingarn herausgegebene Übersetzung schlug ich für physiologisch das englische Wort *normal* vor. Goethe aber gebraucht das Wort physiologisch, weil normal oder gesund ihm nur ein kümmerliches Surrogat ist. In physiologisch klingt Goethes Anschauung von der Natur mit als der gewaltigen schöpferischen Macht, die ewig auf die gesunde Norm und deren Erhaltung drängt. So wird die Bedeutung und der Gebrauch des Wortes physiologisch in dem Anfangs zitierten Satze klar.

FRIEDRICH BRUNS.

University of Wisconsin.

A NOTE ON *HERNANI*, IV, 1

Don Carlos argues that he will be elected emperor, for

Ce Corneille Agrippa pourtant en sait bien long!  
 Dans l'océan céleste il a vu treize étoiles  
 Vers la mienne du Nord venir à pleines voiles.  
 J'aurai l'empire, allons!

Why thirteen stars? As there were only seven electors when Charles was chosen and as, subsequently, there were never more than nine, the number is large, even in the mouth of a candidate. Several other numbers would, moreover, have been as satisfactory as *treize*, so far as meter is concerned. It is not improbable that Hugo, who had made much use of the Bible in *Cromwell* (cf. l'abbé Grillet, *La Bible dans Victor Hugo*, Lyons, E. Vitte, 1910) and makes obvious reference in the last two acts of *Hernani* to the stories of Cain and Belshazzar, was thinking of the thirteen heavenly bodies that did obeissance to Joseph (Genesis, XXXVII, 9) and thus predicted his elevation to power in Egypt:

Vidi per somnium, quasi solem, et lunam, et stellas undecim adorare me.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

---

THE FIRST ENGLISH TRANSLATOR OF WERTHER—  
 A CORRECTION

Mr. William A. Speck has kindly called my attention to his article, "Revealing More Secrets of the Sorrowful Werther," *International Book Review*, May, 1926, where for the first time he showed conclusively Graves's authorship of the 1779 translation of *Werther*. I regret very much that, unaware of Mr. Speck's prior claim to the point, I went over practically the same ground in my article, "The First English Translator of *Werther*," *M. L. N.* XLIII, 36-38 (January, 1928). My contribution now reduces itself to pointing out Graves's authorship of the lines *Werter to Charlotte* and *On Suicide*. Mr. Speck announced at the same time his discovery of the authorship of the *Letters to Charlotte*.

*The Rice Institute.*

ALAN D. MCKILLOP.

---

### THREE IRREGULAR PORTUGUESE (AND GALICIAN) IMPERFECTS

In addition to *ser*, there are three Portuguese (and Galician) imperfects which do not have the usual endings: *ia*, *ias*, etc. They are *tinha*, *vinha*, and *punha* (Galician *tiña*, *viña*, and *puña*). The accent has apparently receded to the radical vowel, the *n* has been palatalized, and the radical vowel has closed. Diez,<sup>1</sup> with his characteristic penchant for a teleological explanation, supposes that *tenía* became *ténia* (written *tenha*) in order to create a yod which should keep intervocalic *n* from dropping as occurred in the infinitive *teer*, *ter*; but at the same time he admits that, except for infinitives, scarcely any other examples of an accent receding from an ending to the radical vowel can be found in Portuguese or in any other Romance language. He further supposes that *tenha* became *tinha* to distinguish this tense from the present subjunctive. Bourciez<sup>2</sup> holds the same view with regard to the recession of the accent, but says nothing about the change from *e* to *i*. He explains that, without this recession, *ponía* would have become *poía*. Similarly *tenía* would have become *teía*. On the contrary, Vicente García de Diego<sup>3</sup> accepts this very form *teía*, from which he derives *teinha* on the assumption that Romance *-ío* and *-ía* became *-inho* and *-inha*. But the only form he gives to support this epenthetic palatalized nasal is the Galician (and Old Portuguese) imperfect of *ir*: *iba* > *ia* > *iña*.<sup>4</sup> In the first place, *iña* can be explained as resulting from analogy with *viña*, both words being closely related in use and meaning<sup>5</sup>; and in the second place, how about all the many other cases of Romance *-ío* and *-ía*; e. g., *fio* < *filu*, *sadia* < *sanativa*? Thus, the theory of Diez and Bourciez explains neither the closing of the vowel nor the development of the palatalized nasal, while the theory of García de Diego has the advantage

<sup>1</sup> Friedrich Diez, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 5th ed., Bonn, 1882, p. 544.

<sup>2</sup> E. Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane*, Paris, 1910, p. 438.

<sup>3</sup> Vicente García de Diego, *Elementos de gramática histórica gallega*, Burgos (no date), p. 123.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Jules Cornu, *Portugiesische Sprache*, in Gröber's *Grundriss*, 2d ed., Strassburg, 1904-6, I, 1030, 1037.



of explaining the closing of the vowel (for pretonic *e* followed by *i* becomes *i*), but does not explain the development of the palatalized nasal. A theory must be sought which will explain both phenomena.

At the outset, several explanations that may suggest themselves must be disposed of. First, two forms of metaphony: *tenía* > *teína*, and *tenía* > *téina*. The former could not be paralleled anywhere in Portuguese, as in such cases as *rabia* > *raiva* we are dealing with a yod and not with an accented *i*. The latter would lead us nowhere, as we should still have to explain the change from *e* to *i* under the accent. And, lastly, *tenía* > *teniá* or *teniê* as in some verbs in Old Spanish.<sup>6</sup> This shifting of the accent to the strong vowel to avoid the hiatus, followed by a later recession, might solve the whole problem, but such a shifting never took place in Portuguese.<sup>7</sup>

In expounding the present theory for the development of these forms, we shall begin with the assumption *tenebam* > *tenea* > *tenía* as generally presented.<sup>8</sup>

In French and Portuguese *n* and *m* in certain positions nasalize the preceding vowel. But in Portuguese we have a phenomenon which does not appear in French, viz., *n* and *m* nasalizing the vowel that follows them. We have, for example, the following developments: *nidu* > *niu* > *não* > *ninho*; *mêa* > *mia* > *mãa* > *minha*; *mihi* > *mi* > *mim*. Now in *tenía* the *n* worked both ways. It nasalized both the preceding vowel and the following vowel, giving *tēñia*. Intervocalic *n* dropped at an early date, and thus we arrive at *tēia*.<sup>9</sup> At a somewhat later date, a nasalized

<sup>6</sup> Cf. R. Menéndez Pidal, *Manual de gramática histórica española*, Madrid, 1918, p. 245; and J. D. M. Ford, *Old Spanish Readings*, Boston, 1911, p. 120.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Cornu, *op. cit.*, p. 1023; and F. Hanssen, *Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana*, Halle, 1913, p. 106. This is, furthermore, confirmed by the fact that unaccented radical vowels never show the presence of a yod in the imperfect as they do in the first and second persons plural of the present subjunctive, and in Old Spanish in the imperfect indicative (cf. Hanssen, *loc. cit.*).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Menéndez Pidal, *op. cit.*, p. 244 and p. 53; Hanssen, *op. cit.*, p. 105; Adolf Zauner, *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin, 1914, I, 146; and W. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, Paris, 1895, II, 326.

<sup>9</sup> Such a double nasalization is present in the modern form *põem* (3d plu. pres. ind.), although it is here produced by two different *n*'s.

vowel followed by another vowel generally lost its nasalization, except nasalized *i* followed by *a* or *o*, where the nasalization developed into *nh* after the *i*; e. g., *luna* > *lūna* > *lūa* > *lua*; *corona* > *corōna* > *corōa* > *corōa*; but *vinu* > *vīno* > *vīo* > *vinho*; \**cocina* > *cozīna* > *cozīa* > *cozinha*; *mēa* > *mīa* > *mīa* > *minha*. Thus, in *tēia* the nasalization of *ē* drops and *īa* becomes *inha*, giving the form *teinha*. Meyer-Lübke may have a like theory in mind, but he offers no analysis, merely referring to *cenizas* > *cēizas* > *cinzas* as a similar development.<sup>10</sup> The quite common Old Portuguese forms *vīr* and *viinr* < *venire*, and *vīdo* and *viindo* < \**venitu* are interesting additional examples of a regressive and progressive nasalization produced by one and the same *n*.<sup>11</sup> But in these cases, instead of *nh*, we have a simple nasalization of the second *i* because the syllable is checked. In the modern infinitive the nasalization has entirely disappeared: *vir*, while in the modern past participle the progressive nasalization is retained: *vindo*. Progressive nasalization also explains *fenuclu* > *funcho* better than a shifting accent<sup>12</sup> or an epenthetic *n*,<sup>13</sup> as follows: *fenuclu* > *fēnūclo* > *fēūclo* > *funcho* > *funcho*. But to return to *teinha*: pretonic *e* followed by *i* becomes *i* giving the form *tīinha*.<sup>14</sup> The two *i*'s are then contracted into one, giving *tinha*, the modern form.

*Venía* has developed in the same way, as follows: *venía* > *vēnīa* > *vēīa* > *veinha* > *viinha* > *vinha*. *Ponía* develops as follows: *ponía* > *pōnīa* > *pōīa* > *poinha*. Pretonic *o* followed by *i* becomes *u*, giving the form *puinha*.<sup>15</sup> The *i* is then absorbed by the *u*, giving *punha*, the modern form.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 326, and I, 406, 334.

<sup>11</sup> This explanation of the development of *vindo* is given in Hills, Ford and Coutinho, *A Portuguese Grammar*, New York, 1925, p. 292.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Friedrich Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 5th ed., Bonn, 1887, p. 140.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Gustav Gröber, "Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter," in *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1883-1908, II, 284.

<sup>14</sup> Either by assimilation or by the metaphonic influence of the following *i*. Furthermore, the change of pretonic *e* to *i* is quite a common phenomenon, independent of the vowel that follows, cf. J. J. Nunes, *Chrestomathia archaica*, Lisbon, 1921 (2d ed.), *Introdução*, p. xxxix, Obs. i.

<sup>15</sup> Compare: *rōi* > *ruim*; *coido* > *cuido*.

<sup>16</sup> Compare Old Portuguese *chuīva* > *chuva*; Old Portuguese *luīto* > *luto*; and *cuido* > popular *cudo*. Compare also *fiuncho* > *funcho*.

The modern forms *tinha*, *vinha*, and *punha* are thus attained without the arbitrary and unsubstantiated assumptions of a recessive accent or an epenthetic palatalized nasal.

EDWIN B. WILLIAMS.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

### THE VALKYRIE EPISODE IN THE *NJALS SAGA*

On Good Friday 1014 there took place the famous battle of Clontarf, fought between the Irish king Brian Boróimhe and his allies on the one hand and the Scandinavian Vikings of Ireland and the Western Isles on the other. The events of that battle are related, not only by the Irish chroniclers, but also in the Icelandic *Njáls Saga*.<sup>1</sup> After reporting the fall of Brian as well as that of his slayer, the sagaman mentions a number of omens and visions foreboding the battle or announcing it, while it was in progress, to people living many hundred miles away from the battlefield and from Ireland. It is one of these visions which will hold our attention on the following pages. The text reads as follows in English translation:

On Good Friday that event happened in Caithness that a man whose name was Daurrud went out. He saw folk riding twelve together to a bower, and there they were all lost to his sight. He went to that bower and looked in through a window slit that was in it, and saw that there were women inside, and they had set up a loom. Men's heads were the weights, but men's entrails were the warp and weft, a sword was the shuttle, and the reels were arrows. During the work they were singing a weird song referring to the impending battle.<sup>2</sup> Then they plucked down the woof and tore it asunder, and each kept what she had hold of. Now Daurrud goes away from the slit, and home; but they got on their steeds and rode six to the south, and the other six to the north. A like event befell Brand Gneisti's son in the Faroe Isles.

<sup>1</sup> *Brennu-Njáls saga*, herausgg. v. F. Jónsson, Halle, 1908, p. 412 ff.; for a good English translation cf. G. W. Dasent, *The Story of Burnt Njal*, Edinburgh, 1861, p. 338 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Eddica Minora*, ed. A. Heusler u. W. Ranisch, Dortmund, 1903, No. x; for other bibliographical data cf. P. Herrmann, *Die Heldensagen des Sazo Grammaticus*, Leipzig, 1922, p. 118.

A vision in much the same style is found in the *Sturlunga Saga*:<sup>3</sup>

In the winter following the battle of Viðines (1208) an Iclander in a dream saw himself entering a large house, where he beheld two women covered with gore and rowing in a lake of blood while singing an equally weird song.

Both visions have repeatedly been quoted as welcome material of bearing on the Teutonic valkyries and their rôle in the religious belief of the Scandinavian North.<sup>4</sup> Such a procedure is however not without hazards, as I hope to show with the help of Irish texts. For it is to be noted that precisely this type of vision recurs in Irish documents.

Before the battle of Moylena (put in the second century of our era by the Irish synchronists), three repulsive-looking witch-hags with blue beards appeared before the armies, hoarsely shrieking victory for Conn the Hundred Fighter and defeat and death for his rival, King Eoghan.<sup>5</sup> In the fourteenth century, the clan Brian Roe, when marching to their destruction at the impending battle of Doolin (1317), saw in the middle of a ford a hideous-looking gigantic hag "with grey dishevelled hair, blood-draggled, and with sharp-boned arms and fingers crook'd and spare, dabbling and washing in the ford, where mid-leg deep she stood beside a heap of heads and limbs that swam in oozing blood." Asked who she was, she answered in a loud, croaking voice that she was the Washer of the Ford, and that the bloody human remains she was washing were their own heads and limbs which would be lopped off and mangled in the coming battle. Then she vanished before the terrified eyes of the soldiers.<sup>6</sup>

There can be little doubt that the two groups of visions, the Norse and the Irish, belong to essentially the same type. Further, in both countries, Iceland as well as Ireland, the accounts of the

<sup>3</sup> *Sturlunga Saga*, ed. Gudbrand Vigfusson, Oxford, 1878, vii, 28. Cf. also Herrmann, *op. et loc. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> W. Golther in *Abh. d. Münchener Akademie d. Wissenschaft., philos.-philol. Kl.*, xviii (1890), p. 429 f.; G. Neckel, Walhall, Dortmund, 1913, p. 80 f.; Dasent, *op. cit.*, I, p. cxevi. From Golther's remarks it is clear, however, that he had his misgivings about the identification of the hags of the two visions with the valkyries.

<sup>5</sup> E. O'Curry, *The Battle of Magh Leana*, Dublin, 1855, p. 119, 121.

<sup>6</sup> P. W. Joyce, *A Social History of Ancient Ireland*, London, 1903, I, 269.

visions were written down a considerable time after the historical event to which they were attached. The question of the historical priority of the two groups is then not easy to settle. It is safe to assert, however, that neither group as represented by extant documents can possibly be regarded as the *direct* source of the other. Let us next enquire into the traditional character of these figures, that is, into their connexion, if there be such, with Celtic and Teutonic religious belief. The Irish hag is a well-known figure in Celtic mythology and folklore,<sup>7</sup> and the witch of the battle of Doolin is no other than Badb or Mórrigan, the Irish war-fury, who appears also in the purely Irish accounts of the battle of Clontarf.<sup>8</sup> The three witches of the battle of Moylena are the three Irish war-goddesses Ana, Badb, and Macha, whose mast-food, in an ancient glossary, is said to be the heads of the men slain in battle.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, no such divinities are known in the ancient Teutonic religion, which lacked a goddess of the type of the Roman Bellona and the Irish Mórrigan. The only figures which in any way resemble these are the Valkyries,<sup>10</sup> all of them, however, vastly more impersonal and altogether lacking the plasticity of the Celtic Mórrigan and her numerous descendants, the "hags of slaughter," as they are called in Gaelic folk-tales. Under these circumstances it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the two Icelandic visions which formed the starting-point of this enquiry are not Teutonic at all but of Celtic origin, having drifted north, to Iceland, with a good deal of other Celtic legendary material.

The problem does not end there, however. The sinister figures of the *Njáls Saga* are seen weaving, a feature not found in the Irish parallels. It is clear that this activity of the war witches is connected with the Teutonic belief in the Norns and the conception of their spinning or weaving the fate of man.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup> I have dwelt more at length on this curious type in my recent book *Balor with the Evil Eye*, New York, 1927, p. 132 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Joyce, I, 266; cf. also J. H. Todd, *The War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, London, 1867, p. 174 f.

<sup>9</sup> W. Stokes, *Three Irish Glossaries*, London, 1862, p. xxxv.

<sup>10</sup> G. Neckel, *op. cit.*, p. 74 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the etymology of O. E. *wyrd*, O. H. G. *wurt* = fate, death, from the same root as Lat. *vertere*, O. H. G. *wirt*, *wirtel* = spindle; cf. R. Eisler, *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt*, München, 1910, p. 241; H. Güntert,

Lastly, the Celtic texts say nothing about the witches rushing to the scene of the disaster, as at least six of them do in the *Njáls Saga*. There exists, however, one Teutonic parallel, from a considerably later period, it is true, which goes far to show that this particular trait is likewise a Norse addition to a more rudimentary legend of Celtic provenance.

When the powder magazine at Malines, in Belgium, was blown up by a stroke of lightning in 1546, the city was partly destroyed and many of the inhabitants were killed. Soon after, some merchants coming from Friesland reported that they had seen a large swarm of devils flying in the air toward Malines. One of them was heard shouting to another: "Take the mill (in front of which the merchants were standing) along." But the second answered: "I can't; I have to go to Malines. Short-tail (another devil) is to take care of the mill." And the mill was indeed destroyed that same night.<sup>13</sup>

To sum up: the visions foreboding impending disaster, found in the *Njáls* and *Sturlunga Sagas*, are essentially of Celtic, i. e. probably Irish, origin. The episode of the *Sturlunga Saga* is almost purely Celtic in structure and content.<sup>13</sup> The vision of the *Njáls Saga*, embodying, no doubt, eleventh century material, has skilfully fused the Irish vision tale of the Mórrígan and her weird sisters with features of Scandinavian belief in the Norns and added the Teutonic, perhaps even christian, conception of the demons rushing to a scene of disaster and overheard by a mortal.<sup>14</sup> Neither of the two visions can therefore be safely utilised for an enquiry into the Teutonic legends connected with the valkyries, and their origin.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

University of Minnesota.

---

*Kalypso*, Halle, 1919, p. 253; further the O. E. word *freoðuwebbe* and the Dutch *oorlog* = war.

<sup>13</sup> J. W. Wolf, *Niederländische Sagen*, Leipzig, 1843, p. 278.

<sup>13</sup> As Golther pointed out (*op. cit.*, p. 430), the song of the war witches of the *Njáls Saga* exercised a certain influence upon the verses quoted in the *Sturlunga Saga*.

<sup>14</sup> On the "Overhearing motif" cf. Bolte-Pölvka, *Märchen-Anmerkungen*, II (1915), p. 481 f.; Tawney-Penzer, *The Ocean of Story*, London, 1924 ff., I, 48; II, 107, 219 f.; III, 48, 60 ff.; A. Wesselski, *Märchen des Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1925, p. 205 f.



## REVIEWS

*Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum, Richard FitzRalph's Sermon: 'Defensio Curatorum,' and Methodius: 'þe Byggyng of the World and þe Ende of Worldes.'* By John Trevisa. Edited by AARON JENKINS PERRY. Oxford University Press for the E. E. T. S., Orig. Ser. 167. 1925 (for 1924). Pp. clvi + 116.

*A Stanzaic Life of Christ . . . from MS. Harley 3909.* Edited by FRANCES A. FOSTER. Oxford University Press for the E. E. T. S., Orig. Ser. 166. 1926 (for 1924). Pp. xliii + 456.

*The History of the Translation of the Blessed Martyrs of Christ Marcellinus and Peter.* The English Version by BARRETT WENDELL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926. Pp. 115.

This edition of three hitherto unpublished pieces of translation by John Trevisa is very welcome. We have been able to estimate his quality as a translator from his version of Higden's *Polychronicon*, but we have had no means of knowing whether his prose was equally good in other kinds of work. The *Dialogue between a Knight and a Clerk* sets at rest any doubt on that score. Of course much of the merit of this debate belongs to the Latin, which is ascribed to William of Occam; but in its English dress it is so brisk and entertaining that John Trevisa deserves more than a little praise. In spite of his precise habit of using doublets to translate single Latin words—a custom perhaps less peculiar to him than Professor Perry thinks—Trevisa wrote extremely good prose. So did various other men of his day, it being only modern pedantry to regard a style different from ours a clumsy style. Richard FitzRalph's diatribe in defence of the secular clergy as against friars, which he delivered at Avignon in 1357, suffers little from translation, as one can be sure even without knowing the original.

Aside from their interest as specimens of Trevisa's prose, both of these works have value for the history of opinion and manners. The basis of sovereignty is discussed with vigor in the *Dialogue*, the knight having the better of the argument; and in the so-called *Sermon* the charges that were current against the Franciscans in the second half of the fourteenth century are unsparingly detailed. That Trevisa should have approved the views set forth in both cases, though one work had been written by a Franciscan leader

and the other by a bishop of Armagh to whom all contemporary Franciscans were an abhorrence, is of itself worth noting.

Professor Perry's edition of these valuable materials is remarkable for the good intentions and the industry he has shown rather than for his accomplishment. His account in the Introduction of the MSS. and the early prints is painstaking, as is the still longer discussion of Trevisa's life and works. Unfortunately he shows so little power of arrangement and of compression that one finds it difficult to work through to his conclusions. A typical example is his examination of *De Re Militari*. On p. xcv, note 8, we see that the editor believes in Trevisa's authorship, yet on p. xcvi we find three cogent reasons presented against this view. The difficulty appears to be that Mr. Perry has printed all the notes he has ever taken, without going to the pains of thoroughly digesting them. The result is that much money has been wasted, and much time will be wasted by the scholars who have to use the book. One becomes impatient with such futility.

On the other hand, we must give the editor credit for the immense amount of labor he has done. His industry in examining the MSS. and all relevant records is beyond dispute. Probably, too, his texts may be trusted, though the list of *corrigenda* is rather formidable, and should have been lengthened by obvious errors on pp. 15 and 17, which he has not noted.

Miss Foster, to whom we already owe the excellent edition of the *Northern Passion*, has admirably edited this life of Christ in quatrains, composed in Chester before the end of the fourteenth century. Although the work has little merit of itself, being a mere compilation in undistinguished verse of material chiefly drawn from Higden's *Polychronicon* and the *Legenda Aurea*, it well deserves the attention of scholars because of its relationship to the *Chester Plays*, if for no other reason. Miss Foster shows conclusively that the *Nativity* and the *Purification* were based on the *Stanzaic Life* now printed, while the *Adoration* and the *Oblation of the Magi*, the *Temptation*, the *Harrowing of Hell*, and the *Ascension* seem to have had the same source. A possible influence on four other plays can also be traced. It is clear, as Miss Foster says, that the original Chester cycle "was written by a man who knew the *Stanzaic Life*." As a connection between five other plays and vernacular literature had already been noted, we now know that to a very considerable degree the authors of the cycle depended for their material on English writings instead of Latin. In other words, they took what was nearest at hand and most easily remembered.

The fact that such a use was made of the *Life* now before us lights up wonderfully its rather dreary stretches of commonplace verse. The author says (l. 9) that "a worthy wight" desired him to put into English "certain things" that he had seen in

Latin. The result is a work of more than ten thousand lines, which includes most of the stories from the Bible that a layman needed to know. As Miss Foster points out, these were the stories most often shown in sculpture and glass. Evidently, then, the simple quatrains that seem tedious to the modern reader not only furnished materials for the dramatic representation of scriptural events, but satisfied a real need by way of explaining the pictorial representations to be seen in the churches. The reader would be rewarded, furthermore, by a good deal of lore and a good many stories which have little to do with the Scriptures. Instruction could scarcely have been furnished him in a more palatable form. For conciseness, as well as accuracy of statement, Miss Foster's introduction and notes leave nothing to be desired, while her glossary is equally well done.

It is a pleasure to read and to praise, even though belatedly, Professor Wendell's translation of a work which has been too much overshadowed by another production of the same author. There is no question that Eginhard will always be chiefly remembered by his *Vita Caroli*; yet that is no reason for neglecting his altogether delightful account of the adventure by which he secured the bodies of two supposed saints in Rome, together with a miscellaneous lot of other relics less important and valuable. Eginhard's treatise has been carefully studied by Marguerite Bondonio, *La Translation des saints Marcellin et Pierre* (Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études, 160, 1907). The reader who cares to know its importance as a revelation of political conditions and states of mind in the ninth century should turn to her monograph. It is sufficient to say here that Mr. Wendell was right in thinking that Eginhard's little book ought to be turned into English. Certainly no one interested in the history or literature of the ninth century can afford to be ignorant of it.

Mr. Wendell's translation is a very satisfactory one—better, it seems to me, than Teulet's careful version in French. His prose is stiffer than Eginhard's; it does not suggest very well the rhythms of the Latin; but it is pleasant in its own mannered way and keeps close to the text. We should be grateful that he had the inclination to do the translation and that he lived to complete it. We may well be grateful also that it has been issued in so beautiful a form by the Harvard University Press.

GORDON HALL GEROULD.

Princeton University.

*Surnames.* By ERNEST WEEKLEY. Second Edition. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927. xxii + 364 pp.

*The Romance of Words.* By ERNEST WEEKLEY. Fourth edition. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927. xii + 255 pp.

*The Knowledge of English.* By GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1927. x + 572 pp.

*The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time as Taught by William Bullokar, with Word-Lists from All His Works.* By R. E. ZACHRISSON. (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistika Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 22:6) Uppsala and Leipzig, 1927. xvi + 243 pp.

*On the Origin of the Gerund in English.* By GEORG CH. VAN LANGENHOVE. "Phonology." (Université de Gand, Recueil de Travaux publiés par la faculté de philosophie et lettres, 56<sup>e</sup> fascicule.) Gand and Paris, 1925. xxviii + 132 pp.

The two volumes by Weekley are apparently unchanged reprints, *Surnames* of the 1917 edition and *The Romance of Words* of the 1922. These works, though they are rather popular than scholarly in character, nevertheless have a good deal of interest and value for the serious student of English linguistic history.

The scope of *The Knowledge of English* is clearly suggested by its title. The chief purpose of this work is, however, not to impart knowledge for its own sake; "increase of effectiveness in the use of the English Language" is made at least co-ordinate with "increase of knowledge." Though this volume presents in combination many of the elements usually found singly in manuals of grammar and rhetoric, handbooks on pronunciation, and treatises on style, as well as in histories of the language, it is at the furthest remove from an encyclopedic compendium of authoritative pronouncements upon particular questions. Its plan is to provide the intelligent user of English with such a body of fact and such discussion of general principles as will equip him to exercise discriminately his own judgement. This competent presentation of underlying principles and the insistence upon individual responsibility give the work its distinctive value. Its chief blemish lies in occasional inexplicable lapses in statements of fact—puzzling contradictions or statements so broadly and loosely made as to be misleading. But despite these surprising lapses, *The Knowledge of English* goes far toward attaining its chief end, that of "making clear at least a reasonable attitude of mind towards the many and variegated

problems presented by the English language in its practical applications." The publishers have done admirably by the volume.

Zachrisson's study is in the first instance a critical examination of all the works of the Elizabethan spelling reformer, William Bullokar, in the effort to deduce information concerning the pronunciation of English which was current in London during the latter half of the sixteenth century. Since Bullokar's chief aim was only the amendment of the conventional orthography, largely by means of diacritical signs, his system lacks precision and is by no means free from ambiguity. Moreover a system such as his, even if the user of it is a competent observer and careful and consistent transcriber—as Bullokar apparently was not—is peculiarly susceptible to mistake in passing through the hands of the printer. As a consequence, Bullokar's works, important as they are because of their extent, demand such a critical examination as Zachrisson has given them. The presentation of Bullokar material includes not only a discussion of Bullokar's symbols and the sounds represented by them together with rime-lists and word-lists extending over almost fifty pages, but also a collation of Plessow's reprints (*Palæstra* LII) with the originals, a facsimile reproduction of a page in Bullokar's *Æsop's Fables*, an examination of especial elements of his vocabulary, and an attempt—on slight evidence, to be sure—to arrive at the provenience of Bullokar's family.

The attempt to determine Bullokar's probable pronunciation becomes practically a review of the whole subject of the sounds of early standard English in the light of even the most recent studies in this field. Such a review at Zachrisson's hands is of great value. It results in a redefinition, with some modification in particulars, of Zachrisson's own position. His most significant change is from insistence upon uniformity to a conviction that "not only the isolated words but also *one distinct sound* was often pronounced differently by different speakers" (p. ix). These differences Zachrisson considers "not, in the first place, due to dialectal importations but principally to the existence in early Standard speech of advanced or colloquial forms of pronunciation, by the side of learned or more old-fashioned ones" (p. x). One would expect both causes to be vigorously operative in sixteenth century London speech. Zachrisson reaffirms his distrust of the early orthoepists and his reliance upon the evidence of occasional spellings. This attitude has led him to make a rigid paleographical examination of the most important early Modern English documents of colloquial character; as a result, he presents a number of significant corrected readings, which constitute not the least valuable part of his study.

It is fortunate for students of the history of early Modern English sounds that Zachrisson was unable to carry out his inten-



tion of publishing his study of Bullokar in 1913; the work as then planned could not have had the value and service of the present one. It is unfortunate that numerous and at least occasionally serious typographical errors appear.

The aim of van Langenhove's study is "to treat as fully as possible of the morphological development of the verbal noun, present participle, and infinitive up till the close of the Middle English period" (p. x) in the attempt to solve the problem of the origin of the English gerund by an approach other than that through syntactic studies. His conclusion (pp. 131-32) is that the gerund is only a form of the infinitive, and that it "owes its existence to a double confusion: (a) of the inflected and uninflected infinitives, as its form is the inflected one without the preposition *to*; (b) of this infinitive in *-n* and the verbal noun in *-ing*, both words having in the spoken language the same form, often the same meaning, sometimes the same construction." The statement that the form of the gerund is that of the inflected infinitive without *to* is apparently based (pp. 126 ff.) on a small number of such forms as "to wetynge," "to menyng," "to doiinge" which are found in some Middle English texts. The ending *-yng*, *-ing* (ɪŋ) is given a possible double origin (p. 126): first, after the original suffix *-enne* of the inflected infinitive had been reduced to *-in* or *-en*, *-ŋ* was substituted for *-n*; second, from late Old English onward, van Langenhove states, the verbal noun ended in *-n*, so that "in the spoken language the infinitives in *-n* and the verbal noun in *-n* were no longer distinguished the one from the other." It is assumed, apparently, that when the infinitive and the verbal noun had both come to have a common form terminating in *-n*, this coalescence caused the extension to the infinitive of the termination *-ng*(-ŋ) which was normal to the verbal noun. The further argument seems to be (pp. 127-28) that since the inflected, prepositional infinitive had acquired the suffix *-ing* (-ɪŋ), the simple infinitive must also have acquired this same suffix, because both the inflected and the simple infinitive had become confounded in early Middle English. The gerund would thus be only a somewhat specialized development of the infinitive which had acquired the suffix *-ing* (-ɪŋ).

In my judgment the development thus urged is at best only a possibility—certainly not a demonstrated actuality. The occasional "to —ng" forms, on which apparently the argument is based, may be in part verbal nouns, in part learned imitations of Latin syntax. In the texts in which these forms occur, the infinitive ends normally not in *-n* but in *-e*, and if the scribal usage was as conventional and traditional as van Langenhove insists that it was, *-n* must have fallen away so early that the suggested substitution of *-ng* (-ŋ) is altogether unlikely. Finally, if there



had ever been complete confusion and coalescence of forms, the later actual differentiation would demand explanation.

A brief notice such as this, does not permit any review of van Langenhove's detailed presentation of the morphological development of the Old and Middle English forms which fills the greater part of this study. The entire work is marked by great industry and learning—and by almost too great ingenuity.

W. F. BRYAN.

*Northwestern University.*

---

*Arthur of Britain.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. Sidgwick and Jackson, London, 1927. Pp. viii + 299.

*Romans, Kelts and Saxons in Ancient Britain.* By R. E. ZACHRISSON. Uppsala, 1927. Pp. 95.

If the definitive history of King Arthur is ever written, it will be written by a medievalist who is both a Celticist and a Romanicist; who is expert in etymology, particularly in that difficult field, the etymology of medieval proper names; and who is versed in the ways of popular as well as literary tradition. Few men, of course, have such an equipment—if indeed any man now living can lay claim to it. And Sir Edmund Chambers, excellent medievalist though he is, rightly refuses to undertake an exhaustive study of King Arthur and the problems connected with his name. His book may with justice be described as a manual, in which a survey of the Arthurian field is presented for the guidance of University students and intelligent laymen. As such, the work merits high praise. The author is a true philologist, i. e., he is at home in his texts. He knows how to marshal in orderly ranks the evidence derived from these texts. His English is pleasant to read. These qualities make his book useful and welcome, not only to the beginner but to the trained and tried Arthurian scholar as well. For who does not profit by reading a clear-headed survey, even though it be of his own field?

But the prospective reader must not expect too much. The author does not solve, or even attempt to solve, any of the problems of Arthurian scholarship. He summarizes or presents the material contained in the source-texts. He reviews the learned hypotheses and constructions based on this material. And he tells us where he stands on each controversial point. Beyond this he does not go. Apart from a few distinctly minor matters, the book gives us neither new facts nor new hypotheses. To put it in the scientific jargon of the day, the book does not "extend the boundaries of human

knowledge." Moreover, Sir Edmund is not free from human frailty. He sometimes makes mistakes, and writes with something of a bias. His mistakes and his bias have a certain relationship. That he is no Celticist is sufficiently obvious from his repeated use of *Mabinogi* as a plural (pp. 67, 68, 69, 155, 205), and from his reference to the Cornish *aruthr* (p. 170). It is natural enough, then, that he should be sceptical about the extent and importance of the Celtic sources of Arthurian romance. This bias manifests itself, on the one hand, in a highly critical attitude toward any Celtic parallels that have been brought forward, and, on the other hand, in an uncritical acceptance of the thesis that "the parallels are generally only for isolated features, and do not extend to the linking together of these in complete stories" (p. 153). To this dictum he allows only two exceptions: the Tristan story and the Beheading Game. One might expect to find the *Charrete* of Chrétien given as a third exception, in view of the well-known parallels and Chrétien's own statement about his source of information, but no; Sir Edmund tells us that "it is not necessary to assume that he [Chrétien] took the whole of any story from a single source" (p. 145). Sir Edmund's faith in the invariable mendacity of the medieval writer may be magnificent, but it is not science. Again, the author is not without prejudice (and this not without cause) against mythological interpretations; thus, he insists on the historicity of Arthur, and derives Arthur's name from the Latin *Artorius*. And yet, curiously enough, he is not willing to accept as the historical prototype of Arthur the only British Artorius of whom we have any record, viz., the Roman general Lucius Artorius Castus. With robust faith, he clings to a fifth or sixth century Artorius for whose historicity we have not a scrap of evidence!

There are not a few other things in the book which call for adverse criticism, but I will confine myself to the points which follow. In discussing Marie and Chrétien, the author remarks (p. 142), "a tradition of conscious literature has begun." The remark may represent nothing more than a momentary lapse, but if it is the author's weighed and considered opinion I must protest. It is dangerous to say that any piece of literature is "unconscious," and certainly in the Middle Ages literary consciousness was in existence long before Marie and Chrétien. Where can be found a work of art more "conscious" and sophisticated than *Beowulf*? And on the Continent literary consciousness was hardly much slower in awakening than in England. On p. 148, the author tells us that "names do not always pass orally in accordance with strict phonetic laws." Whether true or not, this is dangerous doctrine in practice; moreover, so far as the romances are concerned, the variant forms of the proper names are for the most part due to scribal liberties, not to modifications in the

course of oral transmission. As an example may serve the name of Arthur's foster-father, which Sir Edmund records as Entor (p. 158), but which was properly and originally Arthur, as Sommer and Bruce have pointed out. In a number of passages (see pp. 87, 151, 195, 197, 199, 200, 201, 208, 210, 211, 219, 227) the author makes use of the terms *philology*, *philologist*, *philological* when he means *etymology*, *etymologist*, *etymological*. Against this mistreatment of the English language I can only record my earnest protest. Occasionally, it is true, Sir Edmund uses the right word. Thus, on p. 181 he says, "the bear etymology for Arthur is very doubtful." We must be grateful that he did not say "the bear philology." On p. 181 the author, who is discussing the Germanic invasion of Britain, speaks of a wave of Anglo-Saxons who pushed up the Thames valley. But we have no evidence that the Angles invaded Britain by way of the Thames. The wave in question was undoubtedly a wave of Saxons, not of Angles and Saxons. On p. 198 we are told that "it is very doubtful whether the Saxons were at any time far-flung pirates like the Danes who followed them. Their transmarine raids seem to have been limited to the *litus saxonicum*." But there was a Gallic as well as a British *litus*, and the Saxon forays seem to have extended as far as the mouth of the Loire, although they did not reach the Mediterranean as the Danes did later. Gildas himself testifies that the Saxons reached the western ocean (as Sir Edmund notes on p. 199), and it is altogether likely that they reached it by sea rather than by land. On the whole, the description "far-flung pirates" is apt enough for the Saxons of the fifth century at least. On p. 217 the author repeats the old explanation of the Round Table based partly on Posidonius; he seems unacquainted with Mrs. Loomis's admirable study of the iconography of the Round Table (*PMLA*. xli, 771 ff.). In the Bibliography I miss also Matter's fat volume printed in the *Anglistische Forschungen*, and Hulbert's Gawain articles in *Modern Philology*.

Professor Zachrisson's monograph deals chiefly with the survival of the British population in the areas overrun by the English in the fifth and sixth centuries. His conclusions are hardly different from the views current nowadays on the subject: he holds that on the whole the British population was not so much exterminated or expelled as absorbed by the English invaders. The proportionate number of those exterminated or expelled decreases, of those absorbed increases, as one proceeds from east to west. I am in agreement with these conclusions. I must disagree, however, in the interpretation of the linguistic evidence which he presents. The total absence or extreme rarity of place-names of Celtic or Romano-Celtic origin in any given region certainly indicates that the invaders exterminated or expelled the natives pretty thoroughly. But the survival of such place-names does not

prove that there was any mixture of races in the region of survival. It proves rather that here the English occupation was gradual or peaceful; the conquerors had time and opportunity to learn some of the names that went with the countryside. In the United States the Red Indians were not to any appreciable extent absorbed into the population, but Indian place-names survive by the thousand to the present day; similarly in Australia. I believe that the British population was to a large extent absorbed by the English invaders, but I do not base this belief on the survival of Celtic place-names.

KEMP MALONE.

---

*Le Théâtre en France au Moyen Âge I. Le Théâtre religieux.* Par GUSTAVE COHEN. Les Editions Rieder, Paris (Mars 1928). Pp. 80. 59 planches et héliogravures. Prix: 16 fr. 50.

Petit volume élégant de corps et d'âme. Mr. C. y trace l'évolution du drame religieux au moyen âge. Dans une courte introduction il rattache le fait dramatique au fait social et religieux. "Toute religion est par elle-même génératrice de drame." Source du drame le fait religieux en est resté le support pendant de longues générations. Ainsi s'explique la continuité méconnue mais certaine de l'évolution dramatique depuis le XI<sup>me</sup> siècle jusqu'à nos jours. Alexandre Hardy est le locataire des Confrères de la Passion. Corneille avec *Polyeucte* reprend sur les lèvres du moyen âge la phrase religieuse interrompue. Et, surtout, le succès de la Tragi-Comédie au 17<sup>me</sup> siècle est significatif de la survie du théâtre religieux du moyen âge (liberté et diversité des lieux, usage de l'apparition et de la disparition, mélange du comique au pathétique, etc). Or, dit notre auteur, "... la froide tragédie de la Renaissance n'est devenue la tragédie cornélienne qu'après avoir en quelque sorte pris un bain de tragi-comédie." Heureuse formule que Lancaster ne démentira pas.

Les stages de l'évolution sont: Le drame liturgique encore engainé dans l'office divin, le drame semi-liturgique où le latin cède la place au français et où le décor s'avance hors de l'Eglise, enfin les Mystères. Le drame liturgique va en somme du 9<sup>me</sup> au 12<sup>me</sup> siècle<sup>1</sup> et le drame semi-liturgique "correspond sensiblement à la seconde moitié du 12<sup>me</sup> et au 13<sup>me</sup> siècle tout entier." Quant aux Mystères ils continuent la série dans le temps. A ce propos Mr. C. rappelle que les travaux récents de Bédier, Karl Christ, Grace Frank, Emile Roy, Shepard et Thomas (auxquels il faut

<sup>1</sup> Mais on le trouve longtemps après comme en témoignent entre autres documents les Ms. du 14<sup>me</sup> siècle, Nos. 1150 et 833, de Troyes.

joindre Mr. C. lui-même pour sa trouvaille des *Moralités au 14<sup>me</sup> siècle du ms. de Chantilly*) ont fait enfin justice de la prétendue carence du théâtre religieux au 14<sup>me</sup> siècle.

A la fin de son exposé l'auteur utilise sobrement sa découverte du *Livre de conduite du régisseur et compte des dépenses pour le Mystère de la Passion joué à Mons en 1501*. Ce très précieux document nous renseigne sur les entrées en jeu des personnages, les costumes, la mimique, la construction de la scène et la plantation des décors. Les effets obtenus alors par les trucs et "secrets" de la mise en scène sont vraiment étonnants. Qui sait si ce n'est pas dans le théâtre du moyen âge (et ainsi dans le fait religieux et non dans la pression économique) qu'il faut chercher les commencements vrais de la mécanique? Dans le jeu de Mons la machinerie était "confiée à deux spécialistes de Chauny, maîtres Guillaume et Jean Delechière." Les gens de Chauny avaient, nous dit Rabelais, la réputation d'être "grands bailleurs de cynges verts." Mais on peut se demander si en fait ils n'étaient pas d'ingénieux illusionnistes mécaniques plutôt que de simples acrobates et bonisseurs.

La conclusion de Mr C. est que le théâtre du moyen âge a tenté "une entreprise désespérée: figurer sur la place publique . . . l'oeuvre du Créateur, mais que cette entreprise a laissé des ruines encore imposantes et qu'elle était digne de l'époque qui conçut et réalisa . . . la *Divine Comédie*." Sage, juste et mélancolique hommage! Mortellement coincé entre les goûts nouveaux des Humanistes et les scrupules des Réformateurs religieux, ce théâtre devait mourir d'étouffement au 16<sup>me</sup> siècle. Mais qui sait si, sans les coquebins de Coqueret et les parpaillots de Genève, il ne se fût pas repris à vivre et n'eût pas donné des fruits admirables et tardifs?

L'ouvrage de Mr C. est bellement illustré (entre autres gravures toute la série des miniatures du Ms. fr. 12536 de la Nationale). Les fines héliogravures X à XXXVIII, véritables portraits de groupes, sont infiniment plaisantes et instructives. L'impression est soignée. Le diable des coquilles typographiques a pourtant fait des siennes: page 54, ligne 20, *lamère* pour *la mère* et planche XLVI, une virgule intrusive dans le titre de la gravure du haut.

En somme un bon et joli petit livre. Il ne se donne pas comme fait pour les spécialistes mais les spécialistes ne perdront rien à le lire.

LOUIS CONS.

*University of Illinois.*



*Fiction and Fantasy of German Romance.* Selections from the German Romantic Authors, 1790-1830, in English Translation. Edited by FREDERICK E. PIERCE and CARL F. SCHREIBER. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch. Pp. 392. \$2.00.

*The Romantic Movement in German Literature.* Illustrative Texts-Prose and Verse. Selected by KARL BREUL. Cambridge: Heffer. Pp. 505. \$2.00.

At the very close of his long life, Goethe wrote in *Rezensionen und Aufsätze* as follows: "Was man auch von der Unzulänglichkeit des Übersetzers sagen mag, so ist und bleibt es doch eines der wichtigsten und würdigsten Geschäfte in dem allgemeinen Weltverkehr." The idea then is clear, and it is sound. Departments of Comparative Literature, English Branch, owe therefore a large and legitimate debt to Professors Pierce and Schreiber for their diligence. They have edited with care pivotal selections from eleven of the cardinal German Romanticists. Of the twenty-four translations, all are their own except Carlyle's rendering of Tieck's *Der Runenberg*, Longfellow's of *Das Glück von Edenhall*, and W. E. Aytoun's of *Des Sängers Fluch*. With these exceptions they have shunned the thought of doing what has already been done. Their translations reveal feeling and finesse; their prose in truth is superior to Carlyle's.

Of course, their desire to be scholarly was commendable. What they needed was a trifle more nerve. They have condensed in some instances, particularly in the case of Arnim's *Isabella von Ägypten* which is more abridged than they admit. But they should have re-paragraphed Arnim and the others. Not many Germans of Arnim's day, nor of the present either, know the exquisite art of paragraphing. There is never anywhere, under any conditions, a forgivable reason for running a single paragraph through one, two, or three pages, as the Germans sometimes do. The complete translation of Kleist's *Kätchen von Heilbronn* is a most welcome addition to *Weltliteratur*. But, to repeat, one feels a fear of choking on merely looking at the unparagraphed speeches of Theobald and his confederates.

The appendices, with their charts of romantic authors, bibliography, and suggestions for comparative readings, are suggestive and informative, though they cover but five pages. Dr. Pierce's introductory essay on the interplay between English and German Romanticism should disclose a new world to the English student who, frequently and regrettably, is a one-language investigator. It is only a pity that he had to follow such "stop" and "go" signals as were sent out from 35 West 32nd Street, New York City.



Dr. Schreiber suffered from the same source: his good work on the German and his Romanticism is too brief. It omits Lessing, though there are others of the *Zunft* who have done the same. Lessing himself was certainly not a Romanticist; but he just as certainly paved the way and built the bridges for those who were to follow: translations, the short story, philology, the Orient, Romance languages and literatures, cosmopolitanism, new religion, new Bible, elevation of the Jews, manuscripts, fragments, Shakespeare first of all, and even *Das Teutschtum*—these are a few of Lessing's fields.

In 1903, H. Spiess published (Leipzig: Freytag) *Die deutschen Romantiker. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben*. Since this admirable little text has been allowed to lapse, Professor Breul's is the best on the market; and since it is twice as large as Spiess's, it is the best without limitation or condition. And it would have been even more serviceable to the student of German had it not included so many lyrics that have already been edited again and again by Hatfield, Bruns, von Klenze, Nollen, Vos and Barba. But the prose selections could hardly be improved upon: they are of capital importance, and, in the provinces at least, hard to get. The biographical sketches, in German, are well done, though at times a trifle long. There are 97 pages of notes, in English, some of which are detailed almost to the point of intricacy, as in the case of Goethe's *Bei Betrachtung von Schillers Schädel*; some are quite brief, as when we are told to render *was nur* by "whatever."

The student, or reader, who has had no experience in the bringing out of texts of this nature is frequently hypercritical; he is sensitive. He sees a slight and obvious error and all but swoons at the display of "carelessness." It is just about impossible to edit such texts without an occasional and paltry mistake. There are a few in each of these texts, but they are evident misprints, as where Pierce and Schreiber have Tieck born in 1797 instead of 1773, and where Breul has Immermann born in 1794 instead of 1796. Both are good helpful books and should be benevolently received by those who did not work at and on them.

Since each stresses bibliography, and since each keeps away from recent investigations, with the exception of Stephan's *Rheinromantik* and Stockmann's two volumes on *Die Romantik*, a few treatises published since 1925 may be noted.

*Die blaue Blume*, by Cajetan Oswald, (München: Gesellschaft für christliche Kunst, 98 pages, 54 illustrations). Though not erudite, the book is exceedingly pleasing. It treats, with running comment and liberal quotations, such themes as one would readily look for in view of the publisher. And it illustrates these themes with glorious illustrations, some in color, from the works of Steinle,

Schwind, Rethel, Führich, Friedrich and their contemporaries. It is anything but a shoddy "gift" book.

*Humanismus und Romantik*, by H. A. Korff (Leipzig: J. J. Weber, 141 pp.). In his preface Korff says: "Nichts fällt dem Laien im allgemeinen schwerer, als in der verwirrenden Mannigfaltigkeit der Geschichte die grossen Linien zu erblicken." These lines—those between *Humanismus* and *Romantik* in the age of Goethe—Korff has drawn with great clearness. In a sense, the book is a commentary to *Faust*.

*Die Romantik und die Geschichte*, by Kurt Borries (Berlin: Gesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 235 pp.). Of German Romanticism, Breul says: "It was a purely literary revolt." This is a dubious contention. Borries takes a quite different stand. The last words of his treatise are: "Unser geistiges Leben in Kunst, Wissenschaft und Politik bis auf den heutigen Tag ist ohne die Romantik nicht zu denken." The book is supplied with copious notes.

*Gesellschaft und Staat im Spiegel deutscher Romantik*, by Jakob Baxa (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 665 pp.). Baxa asserts that we are just beginning the scientific study of Romanticism. He devotes much space to Görres, Baader, Gentz, Chancellor Hardenberg, Stein and Adam Müller. There are 132 pages of notes and an elaborate chart, somewhat after the fashion of Pierce and Schreiber, though confined to German authors.

*Dichter der Romantik*, by Georg Wendel (Berlin: Emil Ebering, 31 pp.). Written to refute Georg Brandes and to show that Romanticism, instead of being a thing to be overcome, is a movement or tendency to be imitated, if adequately gifted.

*Rahel und Alexander von der Marwitz in ihren Briefen*, by Heinrich Meisner (Stuttgart: Perthes, 311 pp.). As is always the case, throws much light on Rahel and the Romanticism she lived through. Of Marwitz, Rahel writes: "Er war der letzte, den ich über mich stellte." The letters run from June 26, 1809, to December 29, 1813. There are 16 pages of notes.

*Romantik-Land*, by Ludwig Benninghoff (Hamburg: Hanseatischer Verlag, 242 pp.). The Romanticists talked much of *Natur*, *Landschaft*, *Seele*, *Sehnsucht*, *Übersinnlichkeit*, *Volk*, *Mensch*, *Mystik*, *Symbolik*, *Kunst*, and related concepts. This book is an anthology of pertinent selections on these and other themes, illustrated by works of the Romantic painters. Ph. O. Runge's *Quelle* is used to "illustrate" Kleist's *Robert Guiscard*; Rethel's *Der Bannerträger* goes with E. M. Arndt's *Deutscher Trost*. Benninghoff's idea is good, provided we believe strongly in *Gütergemeinschaft der Sinne*, are wholly patriotic, and feel that the Romanticists adopted without reservation Mörike's plea for *holdes Bescheiden* in the perpetual warfare between the material and the spiritual.

*Das Buch der deutschen Romantik*, by Ernst Ludwig Schellenberg (Berlin: Hugo Bermühler, 323 pp.). This is the most lavishly illustrated book that has ever been written on the subject. It goes on the assumption that to a painter of a Madonna a symphony is a Madonna; that to a sculptor, a living actor is a statue, and the reverse. Lessing would have objected; but Lessing has less influence to-day than those who uphold the theory of the federation of the arts. Schellenberg's is an admirable book; though it says many things that have been said before, it says some things that have not been said, and that would not have been said had not the World War turned the sympathetic attention of the humiliated Germans back to the writers of a century ago. But what the German of to-day needs, in this connection, is anthologies; of general treatises he has enough. Pierce, Schreiber, and Breul should mean more to him than Wendel, Korff, and Schellenberg.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD.

West Virginia University.

---

*The History of Harlequin.* By CECIL W. BEAUMONT. London, Beaumont, 1926.

*La Commedia dell'arte.* By CONSTANT MIC. Paris, Pléiade, 1927.

For the last few years handsome books on Italian comedy appear on an average of one every six months or so. The two which have come most recently to my notice are of very unequal value; Mr. Palmer's *History of Harlequin* is a beautifully printed and illustrated, readable collection of more or less authentic facts and anecdotes, unevenly documented and fresh only in certain interesting details on the English harlequinade; Mr. Mic's *La Commedia dell'arte*, also beautifully printed and illustrated, is on the whole the most soundly based and the most authoritative treatment of the subject that has yet appeared.

Mr. Mic, who as C. Miclachevsky, has published two editions in Russian of this work (1914 and 1917), began his study of the *commedia dell'arte* with the production of some plays at the old theater in Leningrad before the war; since then he has spent a great deal of time in searching European libraries for first-hand evidence on all the usually disputed points connected with his subject, and has organized and written up his results in a thoroughly interesting, as well as scholarly manner.

As a result of his theatrical experience, he brings out more clearly than the rest of us have done the vaudeville elements in the old Italian plays, and the kind of showy gifts needed and exer-

cised by the Italian actors. He has based some of his deductions on a unique series of water-color drawings in the Corsini Library of Rome, many of which he reproduces for our delight. The book, in short, is full of valuable material, with an excellent bibliography of recent studies. It is a pity, however, that there is no index, and that the proof-reading is not more perfect; Biancolelli twice misspelled on page 28, Shakespeare's Launce as Lawns on page 46, and several other similar errors slightly mar this otherwise admirable book.

WINIFRED SMITH.

Vassar College.

---

*Festschrift til HJALMAR FALK.* 30 desember, 1927. Fra elever, venner og kolleger. Pp. 10 + 477. Oslo, 1927.

This is a handsome volume containing many a good contribution. Being brought as a tribute of honor to so eminent a linguist as Hj. Falk on his thirtieth anniversary as a professor, the bulk of the book naturally is taken up with linguistic studies ranging from the earliest prehistoric Germanic times down to the colloquial slang of Oslo today. It opens with a delicate little analysis not only of a sound, but also of the social and emotional background of the sound usage by *O. Broch*: "Lyden (š) som expressivt middel i Oslomålet."

The contributions to the prehistory of language are not many, it is true, but all the more weighty. *J. Sverdrup* tackles the difficult problem of the Germanic preterite in the article "Der Aorist im germanischen Verbalssystem und die Bildung des starken Preteritums." He arrives at the not new conclusion that the Germanic strong preterit is a mingled product of perfect and aorist forms. *E. Wessén*: "Till de feminina substantivbøjningarnas historia" is an excellent survey of the prehistory of feminine nouns in the Scandinavian languages. A new explanation of the i-umlaut is offered by *A. Sommerfelt*: "Mangelen på i-omlyd efter kort rotstavelse." *Hj. Lindroth*: "Några anmärkningar om tenues i urgermanskan" tries to establish the pronunciation of the primitive Germanic tenues by comparing the value of the tenues in the modern Germanic languages; he does not, however, include English. He thinks that the primitive Germanic tenues were aspirated initially before a vowel, but not medially between vowels. Especially in the face of the OHG consonant shift this theory seems to be a weak one: He thinks that the difference pf-, -f(f)- reflects original aspirated—not aspirated (or weakly aspirated) tenues.<sup>1</sup> He does not in this

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the view of Prokosch, *The Sounds and History of the German language*, § 32.

connection mention the fact that at the same time OHG in all probability possessed unaspirated tenuis after voiceless spirants, as *fastōn*, which were not shifted at all. To his note on the Icelandic pronunciation it is to be remarked that although nowadays unaspirated intervocalic stops are usual in perhaps two-thirds of the island, it is still an open question if that was so a century ago. For it is only during the last century that the difference between t-d, p-b, k-g was so wiped out as to cause uncertainty in writing. This state of things could be explained, it is true, by supposing the mediae b, d, g to have been distinctively voiced up to this point of time. It might be said, too, that the desonorising of b, d, g was started by Danish influence in Reykjavík. But all this would not account for the fact that the people of the Northeast with their distinctly aspirated intervocalic p, t, k always have reacted strongly upon the weak p, t, k of the Southerners, but never have had any remark to make on their b, d, g. If we are then to consider the Southern p, t, k (without asp.) original, we shall have to assume a change of voiced b, d, g > voiceless b, d, g all over the country and the change of p, t, k > p<sup>h</sup>, t<sup>h</sup>, k<sup>h</sup> in the Northeast. All this considered, I think we had better reckon with aspirated p, t, k medially all over the country in the Icelandic of, say, a century ago. And if that is true, the Icelandic at least does not support the view held by the writer.

It would carry us too far to enumerate all the contributions to Middle and Modern Norwegian, among which there is even a complete dialect monograph "Utsyn over målføret i Ådal (Ringerike)" by *Olai Skulerud*. Both the old and the modern language are discussed in "Om verbets aksjonsarter i norsk" by *A. Western*.

There are, besides, many other contributions dealing with word history, literary history, folk lore, political history, and so forth. *Johan Schreiner*: "Olaf Trygvassons siste Kamp," and *E. Wadstein*: "Ett vittnesbörd om gammal frisisk förbindelse med Ryssland" are both valuable historical contributions. *Reichborn-Kjennerud*: "De gamles begreper om menneskets fysiologi" is a very substantial article. *Knut Liestøl*, "Den store Bøjgen" (of Ibsen's Peer Gynt), *Jón Helgason*: "Ett tapt håndskrift af Heiðrekssaga (Arngrímur lærði's extracts from the H. are shown to go back to a lost MS.) and, last but not least, *F. Paasche*: "Om Kongespeilets forfatter" are excellent articles. But limitations of space prevent me from discussing them. Finally, I will, however, mention one article more, as perhaps being of special interest to English students; it is *A. Trampe Bødker's* "A Study in the Colour of Eyes as represented in literature up to the time of Shakespeare."

STEFÁN EINARSSON.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*



*Plays and Masques at Court during the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles.* By MARY SUSAN STEELE. Cornell Studies in English. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926. Pp. xiii + 300. \$4.50.

*The Court Masque.* By ENID WELSFORD. Cambridge University Press, 1927. Pp. xv + 434. 25 s.

With the publication during the past year of two works dealing with the court masque, both bearing the imprint of university presses, an appreciation of the significance of this unusually interesting dramatic form has been made easier. In spite of the scholarly work of Brotanek and Reyher, not to mention the important consideration by Sir Edmund Chambers, the masque has not received from students of Tudor and Stuart drama the attention it deserves. The two most recent works to treat the masque will once more focus attention on the court revels.

Miss Steele's *Plays and Masques at Court* is not a critical discussion of court functions but, what is much more worth while for the purposes of scholarship, a chronological compilation of all the plays and masques performed before members of the royal families from 1558 to 1642. Such a contribution is a great boon to investigators in pre-Restoration drama. Miss Steele has laboriously gathered together, from many scattered sources, records of courtly representations; her labors will save scholars weary hours of tracking down references in the rather formidable body of documentary literature on the subject. Happily she included not only the plays and masques at court, but also those presented on the royal progresses; hence the work provides a comprehensive hand-list of the dramatic elements in the royal festivities throughout the great period of the drama's development. In this list we have an easy and striking method of comparing the dramatic tastes of the courts of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, and the consequent reflections in the popular theatre. The materials for a systematic survey of the court revels also give further approaches to important phases of English social and political history.

In addition to giving a chronological list of court dramatics, Miss Steele reprints briefly significant comment from such sources as the *Documents of the Revels*, the *Calendar of State Papers*, Nichols's *Progresses*, etc., so that the compilation will furnish many facts and clues for additional investigation in this field. That Miss Steele's work is a doctoral dissertation directed by Professor J. Q. Adams is one assurance of its careful scholarship.

To *The Court Masque*, Miss Enid Welsford adds as a sub-title, "A Study in the Relationship between Poetry and the Revels." She divides her work into three parts: The Origin and History of



the Masque, the Influence of the Masque, and the Significance of the Revels.

Although the writer modestly claims that her "chief aim has been to interpret and to coördinate rather than to accumulate facts," she has advanced many fresh suggestions and some new facts from the realm of comparative literature in providing a synthesis of scholarship on the origins and history of the masque. This portion of the treatise, it seems to me, is Miss Welsford's most valuable contribution. That the influence of the masque on English literature is a theme for a book, the author acknowledges, and her rather sketchy treatment of the subject confirms this statement. She concerns herself chiefly with Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton, but even here she does not exhaust the possibilities. Of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, Miss Welsford believes the suggestion that they should "be regarded as masques has little to recommend it"; yet she goes ahead to show that the plays are Shakespeare's transmutation of the masque into masque-like drama. At times she seems to make a distinction without a difference.

The third section, the author announces, is written in the interrogative instead of the indicative mood. She calls it "The Significance of the Revels." In reality, it is an attempt to discover the relation of the court entertainments to art and aesthetics, and to formulate some sort of philosophy of the revels. The result is frequently far from clear, and the reasoning is often tenuous. Yet Miss Welsford's acquaintance with comparative literature makes her discussion of origins well worth-while; her criticisms and interpretation of the relation of the masque to other literary forms are suggestive; and the work as a whole is a helpful contribution to a study of the masque and its place in English literary history.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*The Influence of Edgar Allan Poe in France.* By CÉLESTIN PIERRE CAMBIAIRE. New York, 1927. 332 pp.

This study is an elaborate consideration of Poe's vogue and influence in France. Something had been done in this direction by earlier scholars,—in particular, by Professor G. D. Morris in his study of French critical opinion of Poe;<sup>1</sup> but Professor Cambiaire

<sup>1</sup> George D. Morris, *Fenimore Cooper et Edgar Poe*, Paris, 1912.

has gone into the subject with an elaborateness and a wealth of detail that would seem to be well nigh exhaustive.

In bringing out Poe's vogue in France Dr. Cambiaire deals first with the earliest critical comments on Poe by the French and certain early translations and adaptations of Poe's stories, and manages in this connection to lay the ghost of an alleged translation of Poe's stories said to have been made by Isabelle Meunier and published at Paris in book form in 1846, and in the same connection he disposes in like fashion of an alleged translation of Poe's "Murders in the Rue Morgue" traditionally held to have been published in the Paris *Charivari* in 1841.

He next considers the subject of Poe's influence upon French poetry, developing at length his influence on Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Paul Verlaine, and Maurice Rollinat among others; after which he traces Poe's influence on the short story in France, and especially his influence on Villiers de L'Isle-Adam, Henri de Régnier, Richepin, and Huysmans—and he notes also certain interesting points of resemblance between Maupassant and Poe, to which, however, he cautiously avoids attaching much significance. Concluding chapters of lesser scope are devoted to Poe's influence on Jules Verne and the pseudo-scientific novel, on the detective novel (especially of Gaboriau and Eugène Sue), and on the dramas of Sardou and Maeterlinck.

Professor Cambiaire maintains that Poe played an important part in moulding modern French literature,—that he was "one of the many influences that inspired" the Parnassian School, that he had much to do with the rise of the Symbolist school in France, and that he has exerted a far-reaching influence on the recent developments in French fiction; he holds, indeed, that Poe's name is "connected with almost every literary movement which has taken place in France since the second half of the nineteenth century." In his enthusiasm for his subject Dr. Cambiaire even suggests that Poe possibly exerted an influence on the vers-librists, though he wisely does not insist on this point.

Much of the evidence that Dr. Cambiaire adduces is drawn from the work of others (and here he is careful with his documentation); but aside from his service in weighing and sifting the judgments of others, he also presents a good body of fresh matter of his own, notably in his comments on Jules Verne, Verlaine, Sardou, and Maeterlinck.

Altogether Dr. Cambiaire's work is a highly creditable study of a very fertile field, and should take high rank among the numerous studies of Poe that have appeared in recent years.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

*The University of Texas.*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

*James Kirke Paulding, versatile American.* By AMOS L. HEROLD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. Pp. xiii + 167. This dissertation throws some new light on a well-nigh forgotten figure, to whom attention has recently been called, says Dr. Herold, by Professors Van Doren and Pattee. Paulding's chief importance seems to lie in his sympathetic handling of the Dutch tradition in New York, and in his following Fielding rather than Scott as a novelist. There is in one chapter an entertaining account of his career as Secretary of the Navy, and a brief and useful synopsis of his novels in another. Of these novels only *The Dutchman's Fireside* seems to have much interest now, but one is glad to have a fairly complete list of Paulding's other fiction, including his tales, for ready reference. Otherwise, the dissertation is disappointing. Dr. Herold says that Mr. Wegelin's *Bibliography of the Separate Publications of Paulding* "contains several inaccuracies"—a somewhat uncharitable remark from one who considers "Van Buren Correspondence in Congressional Library" a sufficient reference for a letter from Van Buren to Jackson about Paulding's appointment as Secretary of the Navy; and who dates Poe's criticism of Paulding's *Life of Washington* simply "1835" though it appeared May, 1836. Dr. Herold writes of Peter Irving, "In 1802 he established and published for three or four years a four-page daily newspaper, *The Morning Chronicle*, one of the half-dozen papers then issued in New York," and adds as a footnote, "*The Morning Chronicle* (1802-1806); *Life and Letters of Washington Irving*" without explaining why he did not give the date of the first issue, if he consulted a file, as the note would indicate. Indeed, exact dates and page references are frequently omitted for no apparent reason; newspaper search, even in readily accessible periodicals like Willis's *Corsair*, and the *Washington National Intelligencer*, seems to have been avoided; and much of the criticism is jejune,—we are informed, for example, that Paulding "genially preached the gospel of work, anticipating both Carlyle and Ruskin." Paulding's relations with Halleck are satisfactorily handled, but the discussion of those with Hawthorne is confusing and not convincing, and that of those with Poe neither accurate nor thorough. A few new letters of Paulding are printed from manuscripts at Yale and in the New York Public Library, but the field of Paulding's biography can hardly be considered exhausted.

THOMAS OLLIVE MABBOTT.

*Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell.* Cambridge, The Harvard University Press, 1926. Pp. x + 320. No doubt many a reader is more fortunate than the writer of these lines in an acquaintance with the great teacher to whose memory these essays are offered. But at least to have seen him plain, to have heard him address a crowded Sanders Theatre, is to carry away an abiding impression of a manifold and stimulating force.

For a variety of reasons, this sheaf of studies is no ordinary tribute. The writers are not only a group of distinguished men from among the many who admired Mr. Wendell, but every one of them assisted him in one or other of his Harvard courses. In a very subtle way the many-sided quality of the master is to be felt in the interests and turn of mind of these his chosen associates. If there was something about Wendell that attracted them to him, there was something also about them as young men and scholars that drew Wendell.

This consideration brings one to the task, impossible to perform within the limits of a brief review, of giving some notion of the multiple direction and long reach of the mental journeyings recorded in these eighteen papers. The promise, held out by the titles, of a wide-cast net of interest is amply fulfilled by the text. Ripe criticism, friendly and provocative, is everywhere. We are taken from philosophy to romance, from lyric poetry to political theory. We are invited to consider, among others, Dante, Chaucer, Cervantes, Marlowe, Li-Po, Scott, Arnold, Yeats, Conrad, Alan Seeger, and Jack Reed. We visit Can Grande's Verona, London in the Middle Ages and under Elizabeth, the Gardens of Fragrance of Iran, La Mancha, the Land of Heart's Desire, Torres Strait, Belloy-en-Santerre, the wall of the Communist Kremlin. And somehow it is all related to Grays Hall in Harvard Yard, to the man who ranged a wide and fertile field of ideas, from Cotton Mather to modern America, from Eginhard to twentieth-century France. Fittingly, the two first papers are able and significant studies of Wendell himself. Through them the reader is offered a fascinatingly direct view of the teacher and philosopher as he was, not in the pages of a book, but to his pupils and friends. Perhaps the greatest tribute to Wendell, a conservative of fearless and adventuring mind, is his recognized power of drawing to himself honest thinkers of radically divergent creeds.

LESLIE HOTSON.

---

*A Short History of English*, with a bibliography of recent books on the subject, and lists of texts and editions. By HENRY CECIL WYLD. Third edition, revised and enlarged. New York, Dutton, 1927. Pp. viii + 294. \$2.50. Students of the English Language

will greet with pleasure the third edition of Professor Henry Cecil Wyld's *A Short History of English*. It is indeed "revised and enlarged," for the author has incorporated in it not only his own investigations in Colloquial English and in the poets' rhymes, but also the new material brought to light by Miss Serjeantson on the West Midland dialects and by Miss Mackenzie on the London dialect. That he has thus included and rendered accessible in his *Short History* the results of these recent investigations, will be a source of gratitude to those who work in the field. The revision is extensive and has been very thoroughly done; a large part of the book has been rewritten; and the enrichments make it in a very real sense a new book. As would be expected, the greatest changes are in the sections dealing with Colloquial English, Modern English, and the West Midland and the London dialects. A whole new section of twenty pages has been prefixed to the chapter on Modern English. Very welcome are the rearrangement of the summaries of the features of the Midland dialects into a comparative table, and the addition of tables showing the chief characteristics of the London-Middlesex and the Essex and City of London dialects.

The numbering of the sections in the second edition has been ingeniously retained for a great part of the book, so that most of the references to the old edition will apply to the new.

In these days of the high cost of scholarly publications, it is a comfort to see so fine and indispensable a book at so reasonable a price.

RUDOLPH WILLARD.

*La Chanson d'Aspremont, d'après un poème du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris: Boivin, [1925], xvi + 208 pp.), by Professor LOUIS BRANDIN, is a worthy successor to his first modernisation, *Berthe au grand pied*. The charm and success of the latter may be judged by the fact that it went through six editions in about two years. *Aspremont* has been treated along similar lines. The picturesque and even fantastic elements of the original are brought out in an eminently readable rehandling; the second part of the story is especially well told. The narrative gains by being relieved of the *longueurs* of the original. The touches of humor of the Old French poem are carefully preserved, as in the vivid episode of the four youths (pp. 37-41) and elsewhere. Some of the lines are short-breathed, giving an impression of brokenness and abruptness akin to that of the mediaeval text. M. Joseph Bédier's spirited preface outlines and evaluates the poem and enables the reader of to-day to see it in its proper setting. There is an enduring eloquence in such phrases as (pp. xv-xvi): "Le jongleur, de toute



sa force, de toute sa voix, . . . lance ses strophes: il n'a pas d'auditeur qui lui soit plus cher que celui-là qui l'écoute encore sept siècles après qu'il s'est tu."

D. S. B.

*The Nature of Human Speech.* By SIR RICHARD PAGET, BART. S. P. E. Tract No. XXII, Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1925. \$1.20. *English Vowel-Sounds.* By W. A. AIKIN, with an Introduction by Robert Bridges. S. P. E. Tract No. XXVI, Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1927. \$0.85. Sir Richard Paget's vowel scale shows the vowels according to the pitch of their characteristic resonances. Like Dr. Aikin's somewhat similar scale, it is not objectively verifiable by others. Miller<sup>1</sup> finds different results. His computations from the phonodeik had shown the characteristics of vowels to be regions of resonance reinforcing harmonic partials of fairly constant pitch for each vowel regardless of the fundamental pitch. Paget finds two resonances for each vowel. Miller had found only one for back vowels and two for front. He artificially reproduced back vowels with one resonance, and converted front to back by eliminating one resonance. Paget's theory that consonants are also determined by resonance requires verification. Miller produced artificial consonants without providing such resonance. Paget's experiments, as described by him,<sup>2</sup> depend on his remarkable acoustic skill, but his results have not gone unquestioned.<sup>3</sup> Paget's contention that an ideal language should lack voiceless consonants is perhaps sufficiently answered by the editor; but two points may be added. For intelligibility, contrast is as important as sonority. Secondly, since every voiceless sound may become voiced, the number of possible articulations would be greatly diminished. Paget's work contains much suggestive experiment, but his application of it to explaining the origin of language is scarcely to be called scientific.

JOHN S. KENYON.

<sup>1</sup> Dayton C. Miller, *The Science of Musical Sounds*, New York, 1916; 2nd ed. 1926.

<sup>2</sup> *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, A*, vols. 102, 106.

<sup>3</sup> See Stephen Jones, *Le Maître Phonétique*, Oct.-Nov., 1924, p. 24.

Through no fault of M. Koszul an error crept into his review of Mr. Peck's *Shelley* between galley and page proof. *MLN*, XLIII, 397, ll. 18, 19, should read: "'tranquillity of freedom', again in a quotation, should be 'of freemen.'"

THE EDITORS.



pas  
core

3.

RT.  
can  
W.  
ract  
ork,  
vels  
Dr.  
by  
the  
of  
tch  
nds  
for  
ack  
mi-  
also  
ced  
et's  
ble  
et's  
nts  
as  
ed,  
ed.  
ca-  
be

6;

of  
II,  
a